

L I V I N G



January, 1939

LIVING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREDICTIVE FACTORS IN THE SUCCESS OR FAILURE OF MARRIAGE	1
<i>Ernest W. Burgess</i>	
MARRIAGE LAWS	4
<i>Albert C. Jacobs</i>	
A PLAN FOR SUCCESSFUL MARRIAGE	8
<i>Pauline Park Wilson</i>	
PREPARATION FOR MARRIAGE IN THE HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM	9
<i>Lawrence K. Frank</i>	
THE NEED OF A WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON THE FAMILY	13
<i>Sidney E. Goldstein</i>	
THE HAPPY FAMILY WITH SUFFICIENT CHILDREN TO SURVIVE	14
<i>Ellsworth Huntington</i>	
WAYS OF LIVING	16
THE FUTURE ADVENTURE	17
THE ADVENTURE ITSELF	18
HUMPTY DUMPTY AFTER THE FALL	21
EDITORIAL COMMENT	25
WORK OF THE CONFERENCE	25
THE AWARD OF MERIT PRESENTED TO FREDERIC OSBORN	26
REGIONAL AND STATE CONFERENCES ON FAMILY RELATIONS	26
STORIES FOR CHILDREN	28
FIRST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILY RELATIONS	30
CONSTITUTION AND OFFICERS OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON	
FAMILY RELATIONS	31

Membership (which includes the Magazine, Living, and full participation in all activities)
is \$2.00. Those who wish to join should send their application to:

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILY RELATIONS,
Law Building, Iowa City, Iowa.

Predictive Factors in the Success or Failure of Marriage

By ERNEST W. BURGESS

Professor of Sociology, University of Chicago

SUCCESS and failure in marriage can be predicted before marriage. This is the outstanding conclusion of several studies already completed or now in progress.

All of these studies proceed upon the assumption that certain factors present before marriage are associated with success and failure in matrimony. The first problem, then, is to find out what factors seem to have a significant relation to marital happiness and in what way these significant factors appear to make for success or for failure in marital adjustment. For example, if age at marriage proves to be a significant factor, the question is what age-groups are most favorable, somewhat favorable, neither favorable, nor unfavorable, somewhat unfavorable, very unfavorable for marital harmony.

A few of the studies made or in progress proceed a step farther. After a large number of individual factors are found to be associated with marital happiness or unhappiness, these individual factors are combined into one general predictive index according to which any one prospective marriage can be rated upon its probabilities of success or failure. This may be called an expectancy table of the probabilities of marital adjustment.

Before considering the factors that have been found to be related to success and failure in marriage, brief reference will be made to the development of research in this field.

Apparently the first attempt to determine the association of a predictive factor with marital happiness was made by Hornell Hart in a study published in *Social Hygiene* in 1926. He was interested in finding out the relation of age at marriage to happiness in marriage. On the basis of comparing records in the marriage license bureau with those of cases in the Domestic Relations Court in Philadelphia he arrived at the conclusions that a high proportion of marriages of men under 24 and of women under 21 turned out to be unhappy and that 29 for men and 24 for women was the optimum age for marriage. These conclusions were attacked by Paul Popenoe on a number of grounds, the most important one being the question of whether or not a fair comparison could be made

between a sample of all marriages as represented by the marriage license group and a highly selected group such as those from the Domestic Relations Court.

In his book *Research in Marriage*, G. V. Hamilton, a psychiatrist, attempted to find the relation to happiness in marriage of a number of factors before marriage.

He made many very interesting correlations, one, for example, the high probabilities of happiness where the husband reports that his wife bears a physical resemblance to his mother. Unfortunately, this intensive and painstaking study included only one hundred husbands and one hundred wives so that very few of the comparisons are statistically significant.

In a study *A Thousand Marriages*, Robert L. Dickinson and Lura Beam compare the characteristics of adjusted and maladjusted couples.

Terman and Bottenweiser, of Stanford University, compared happy, unhappy and divorced couples in relation to differences in personality traits. Many interesting correlations were found. For example, happily-married couples in larger proportions than the unhappy group prefer a play to a dance and desire to avoid arguments. Since their study, however, was made after rather than before marriage, the question is open whether the same answers would be given to the same questions if they were asked prior to marriage. This point is all-important from the standpoint of prediction.

A study recently published *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness*, by Professor Terman, utilized data collected under the auspices of the Institute of Family Relations, Los Angeles. Many interesting correlations are presented in this work showing the association between personality, background and sexual factors and happiness in marriage. The predictive significance of the personality and background factors is also ascertained.

Another study upon which preliminary findings have been published is that of the *Prediction of Marital Adjustment* by L. S. Cottrell and the writer based upon a sample of 526 married couples, residing in Illinois. A few of its findings will be presented in this paper.

Among the studies underway but not completed are one by R. Lowell Kelly, of the Connecticut State College upon the *Personality Traits of Engaged Couples*,

a second by L. S. Cottrell and associates upon the *Marital Adjustment of Rural Couples*; and a third a *Study of 1000 Engaged Couples* by Paul Wolinsky and the writer.

These studies taken together show the rapidly increasing interest in the attempt to isolate factors that have a relation to marital adjustment.

In this paper the findings of the study of 526 married couples by Cottrell and the writer will be drawn upon to identify the factors that seem to be correlated with success or failure in marriage. In interpreting any conclusions it should be kept in mind that these Illinois couples are predominantly although not exclusively an urban white-collar, and professional middle class white American Protestant group. It is possible that different findings might be obtained for other classes in the population.

Instead of using the rating of happiness as the criterion of success in marriage, a score of marital adjustment was secured from the answers given by the husband or the wife to questions on the following points:

I Extent of agreement on:

1. Handling finances
2. Recreation
3. Religious matters
4. Demonstrating affection
5. Friends
6. Intimate relations
7. Caring for baby
8. Table manners
9. Matters of conventionality
10. Philosophy of life
11. Dealing with in-laws
12. Manner of settling disagreements.

II Common interests and activities:

13. Does couple engage in outside interests together?
14. Leisure time preferences

III Demonstration of affection and confiding:

15. Frequency of kissing spouse
16. Do you confide in your spouse?

IV Dissatisfaction with marriage:

17. Frequency of regretting marriage
18. If you had your life to live over
19. Number of complaints about marriage
20. Number of complaints about spouse

V Feelings of anomie:

21. Do you often feel lonesome when with others?
22. Are you usually even-tempered?
23. Do you often feel miserable?
24. Does some useless thought bother you?

25. Are you usually in good spirits?

26. Do you experience periods of loneliness?

27. Are you self-confident about your abilities?

Numerical values were given to each of these items indicative of adjustment in marriage. The sum total of the values on each item for each couple was, accordingly, its marital adjustment score. The range of scores for the 526 couples was from 20 points for very low adjustment to 199 points for very high adjustment. This marital adjustment index has a high correlation with the happiness ratings reported by husbands and wives and with marital disorganization as indicated by divorce separation and whether or not couples contemplated divorce or separation.

Having established the validity of the marriage adjustment index, it was next feasible to correlate with it the answers of husbands and wives to questions bearing upon factors present before marriage which might show a relationship to marital success or failure.

There is only time for a brief resume of the findings:

Some factors show a marked relation with adjustment in marriage:

1. The parents of both husband and wife are happily married.
2. Agreement of husband and wife in desiring children.
3. Close attachment of husband and wife to their respective parents.
4. The cultural background of the family of husband and wife determined by a number of factors such as their nationality, religious preference, church activity, educational, economic and social status combined into an index.
5. Similarity of family background of husband and wife as determined by the same factors as in 4 compared so as to bring out likenesses and differences.

Certain factors show only a moderate association with marital success:

1. Four or more children in family of husband and wife.
2. Place of person in the family. Apparently unfavorable combinations are marriage of an only child with another only child, and of a youngest child with a youngest or only child.
3. Length of attendance at Sunday school.
4. Extent of membership in organizations.
5. Regular work record of husband and wife before marriage.
6. Moderate income at time of marriage.
7. A high ratio of savings to income.
8. Later age at marriage. Early marriages of the

wife before 21 or the husband before 24 are unfavorable.

9. Length of periods of acquaintance, keeping company and engagement.

10. Marriage in church.

11. Wedding performed by a minister.

Other factors show little or no correlation with adjustment in marriage. For example:

1. Difference in religious preference of bride and groom is not statistically significant.

2. Differences in educational level show no correlation with adjustment in marriage.

3. Differences in the economic status of parents of bride and groom, do not appear to affect adjustment in the early years of marriage.

Having determined the factors which are significant associated with marital adjustment, it was then possible to find out in the case of each couple which of the factors were favorable and which were unfavorable. By assigning numerical values to the items under each factor weighted by their relative significance for adjustment in marriage each couple was given a total score of from 220 to 799 points indicating the probabilities of successful marriage.

The findings of this study and of the other research in this field provide positive evidence that by the use of statistical techniques prediction of success and failure of marriage is feasible, in terms to be sure not of the individual couple but of the group into which the couple falls.

The studies already made and those in progress must be regarded as exploratory and the findings so far must be considered as only tentative. But they have demonstrated the feasibility of predicting marital adjustment within certain limits and have indicated the promising prospect for further research in this field.

In the judgment of the writer further progress of research in the field of the prediction of marriage adjustment will come about in four ways:

First, research may be advanced by the inclusion of more significant items indicative of happiness in marriage. Especially desirable are those that are revealing of the attitudes and the values of engaged couples. Case studies of the interaction of persons in keeping company, engagement, marriage will provide hunches and leads for further exploration.

Second, prediction research can be furthered by the adaptation and refinement of statistical procedure to the problems of marriage prediction. When certain factors are found significant they should be analyzed and reduced to their component elements in terms of

attitudes and values and appropriate scales devised for their quantitative measurement. Ultimately, it may be feasible to apply vector analysis to these data and to determine the few basic factors significant for marital adjustment.

Third, it is essential to introduce case histories into the procedure of prediction research. Case-history data secured by interviews have proved valuable in the present study of engaged couples not only as checks upon the accuracy and the meaning of schedule data, but in their own right as revealing the process of integration in courtship and by making possible an analysis of the interaction of different types of psychogenetic personalities and of divergent and similar social types. Case histories will be especially valuable in intensive studies of exceptional case, for example, those with marked deviation from the regression line of a correlation between the groupings upon the pre-marital adjustment index and upon the marital adjustment scores.

Last and most important is the setting up of a Marriage Adjustment Research Institute under whose auspices research in the field of prediction of marital adjustment could be adequately carried on. The Institute should make provision for research staff and facilities in all the pertinent aspects of family life. It should have a biological department equipped not merely to give physical examinations, but to conduct research and build up records upon the hereditary transmission of cancer, mental disorders and physical defects. A department of pediatrics should develop in cooperation with related departments for research in child development. A department of psychology and psychiatry would conduct studies in the effect of psychogenetic development upon personality adjustment in marriage. The Home Economics department would have the opportunity of not only advising the prospective housewife upon dietetics, budgets, and other questions of household management, but of organizing a research program. The department of sociology would specialize in the study of the cultural aspects of personality adjustment. An Institute of Research in Marriage Adjustment would serve at once as a consultation center and as a laboratory of research in the problems of family adjustment. Engaged couples and young married couples would be eager to cooperate as has already been demonstrated in the studies completed and those now under way. For young people even more than the general public have awakened to the fact that success both in marital relations and the rearing of children now depends more than ever before in human history upon the findings and applications of research in the psychological and social sciences.

Marriage Laws

By ALBERT C. JACOBS

Professor of Law, Columbia University

SOCIETY is realizing more and more the interest which it has in the laws dealing with marriage. The people of our generation are witnessing an increasing interest on the part of the community in those whom society permits to marry. Under our form of government the regulation of marriage, it must be recalled, is in the hands of the state governments.

On all sides concern has been expressed over an ever increasing divorce rate. The institution of the family, we are told, is endangered. One out of every five or six marriages now existing is likely to end in the divorce court. Divorce certainly has increased—this no one can deny. Our divorce rate is far greater than that of any country in the western world. 218,000 decrees were issued in 1935; probably more in the succeeding years.

Students of the family realize, however, that little can be done by strengthening the divorce law. Persons will divorce, coerce as the law will. There are roads to marital freedom which the law of divorce cannot close. The control, it has long been recognized, lies in regard to marriage. Well regulated marriages will materially decrease the number of future divorces. For this reason it is appropriate to consider briefly the laws of marriage, to see how and in what ways society is attempting to control and regulate marriage.

It is impossible at this time to present a detailed report on marriage laws. Volume one of Professor Vernier's monumental work on *American Family Laws* has done this for us. Reference should constantly be made thereto. Instead it is our aim to set forth some observations on the problem, to ascertain what are the trends and the tendencies in this field at the present day.

Marriage laws are subject to the control of the state government. The interest of the state in the marriage of its citizens has long been recognized. The state, it is said, is a party to every marriage. This means simply that the state is interested in the well ordered regulation of the family organization of the persons within its borders.

For one reason or another uniform legislation in regard to marriage laws has not gone very far. The Uniform Marriage Evasion Act has been adopted in whole or in part by but five states; the Uniform Mar-

riage License act by but a few states. Differences in background, in religion, in attitudes on marriage undoubtedly account for the failure of uniform marriage legislation.

This report will now proceed to deal with certain important aspects of the marriage laws of this country.

1. Common Law Marriage

Common law marriage, marriage *per verba de praesenti*, valid for many purposes in England prior to 1754 when Lord Hardwicke's Act took effect, is still recognized in one form or another in nearly one half of our states. Common law marriage, or consensual marriage, as it is sometimes called, is based upon the mutual agreement of a man and woman to take each other as husband and wife without the direct sanction or control of the state. Adopted at a time when the conditions of society were far different from those of today, when informal marriages were necessary because of the lack of adequate transportation and communication, common law marriage has long since ceased to serve a useful social function.

Common law marriage defies state control. Where it exists desirable laws such as the eugenic marriage laws cannot be effectively enforced. The possibility of informal marriage lowers the standard of the marriage laws of the state.

It has long been recognized that common law marriage opens the door to blackmail and fraud. The claims of so-called common law widows are too well-known to make further comment necessary. Many estates have been fleeced by this hold-up device.

Because of potential common law marriages titles to property are often rendered insecure. A common law widow, widower or heir may crop up to unsettle the security of the property distribution.

The argument often advanced in favor of common law marriage—that it protects innocent offspring by making them legitimate—does not hold up on sound consideration. The issues of whether there has been a common law marriage probably does not arise until after the death of one of the parties to the alleged relationship, when witnesses are difficult to obtain, when the evidence of what has taken place is uncertain. Common law marriage gives little protection along these lines.

Koegel in his valuable book on *Common Law Marriage and Its Development in the United States* has shown that in the great majority of cases where a common law marriage is alleged that there is a skeleton in the closet. Few persons, not prohibited by law from marrying, intentionally enter into such an informal relationship. Instead the idea of a common law marriage often comes as an after-thought after a meretricious relationship. The cases in the books on common law marriage deal largely with the situation where there has been a formal ceremonial marriage at a time when one or both of the parties were subject to an impediment and continue to live together after the removal thereof.

It is submitted that common law or informal marriage should be abolished. New York, once the leading exponent of such marriages, has not permitted their contraction since April 29, 1933. The situation where the parties, at least one of whom contracts a ceremonial marriage in good faith not knowing of any impediment hereto, instead of being left to the vagaries of the common law doctrine, should be dealt with by a statute such as exists in Iowa, Massachusetts and Wisconsin, to the effect that they will be regarded as married legally from the date of the removal of the impediment.

Advance Notice Laws

The majority of states now have statutes aimed in one way or another to prevent hasty marriages. Such statutes should be enacted in all states. The better form provides that there must be an interval of several days between the application for and the issuance of a marriage license. This permits a determination of the fitness of the parties for marriage. It is submitted that this is preferable to the form of statute which provides for a certain interval between the issuance of the license and the performance of the marriage ceremony. Too often statutes of this kind have been evaded by unscrupulous celebrants. Legislation providing for advance notice cannot be entirely effective in states still permitting common law marriages.

Exceptions to the advance notice law, while perhaps necessary, should be carefully considered.

Age

At common law males of fourteen and females of twelve were fully competent to contract a binding marriage. Even parental consent was not required. These ages have come down to us from pagan Rome of over two thousand years ago. In the great majority of states these ages have been raised by statutory enactment. This, it is submitted, should be the case in all jurisdictions. Eighteen for males and sixteen for females is a desirable goal toward which we can strive.

But in enacting such legislation care must be taken that these are the minimum ages for marriage and that marriages below these ages will still not be good. Such unfortunately is not the case today in a number of states. The law of every state should clearly provide that a marriage below a certain age is void and of no effect, and further the age below which the consent of parents or guardians is necessary.

Certainly the common law ages should be abolished in toto. They are not suited to the needs of this day. Persons of such tender years are ill-suited to start the all-important task of raising a family.

In this connection care must be taken to prevent the falsification of age in the application for a marriage license.

4. Health

The idea that eugenics should play a part in marriage legislation came very late. The common law knew next to nothing of marriages prohibited on the grounds of eugenics. It must be remembered that the rules against consanguinous marriages had no real eugenic basis, but were largely the result of religious dogma. Recently, however, society has become more and more interested in forbidding the marriage of mental and physical misfits. It is submitted that this desirable tendency should be furthered wherever possible.

a. Eugenic Marriage Laws

It would seem axiomatic that persons suffering from a venereal disease should be forbidden to marry, at least until they are cured. The first real attempt to deal with this situation, however, was the Wisconsin Eugenic Marriage Law of 1913. This law required that all male applicants for a marriage license must present a medical certificate showing freedom from venereal disease. Declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of Wisconsin in the celebrated case of *Peterson v. Widule*, this law has been amended and has served as a pattern for somewhat similar legislation in a number of other states. Recently, New York, Illinois, Michigan, Connecticut have endeavored in this way to curb the spread of venereal disease.

Legislation of this character should be enacted in every state. Of course, its effectiveness would be curtailed in those states which still permit common law marriages. The law should provide that every applicant for a marriage license, male or female, should present a medical certificate issued a certain time prior to the application for the marriage license showing freedom from venereal disease. Provision should be made for examination at state expense where necessary.

Laws in a number of states merely provide that a person with a venereal disease cannot marry, or that

a person in applying for a marriage license must make an affidavit that he is not so afflicted, or that if a person has had a venereal disease he must show his freedom therefrom. These laws are worthless as controls of this all-important situation.

b. Mental Incompetency

It is even more difficult to prevent and to control the marriage of mental incompetents. Most states have statutes preventing in one way or another the marriage of insane and lunatic persons. The trouble, however, lies in the difficult task of effectively administering these laws. It is submitted that some effective premarital control should be established. Annulment or divorce for mental incompetency comes too late; the damage may well have been done. Furthermore, considerable attention should be paid to just what we mean by a person having the mental capacity to marry. Certainly the definition of the courts that a person is competent to marry if he is able to understand the rights and duties of marriage even though he may not be competent in other regards does not stand up in the light of medical information. Much can be done by license officers in refusing marriage licenses to persons who are mentally incompetent to contract a marriage.

c. Epilepsy

A number of states have statutes purporting to deal with this situation. They prohibit the marriage of persons one of whom is an epileptic unless the female is over forty-five. It is submitted that this is a practical way of meeting the problem and that laws of this kind exercise some deterrent force. It ought further to be noted that the majority of states refuse to grant an annulment where it is discovered subsequent to the marriage that one of the spouses is afflicted with this disease.

The adequate regulation of the health requirements for marriage, physical as well as mental, is a question second in importance to none in this field. Too great stress cannot be placed on it. Much work of a legal as well as of a non-legal character remains to be done in this particular. More effective controls must be set up to prevent the marriage of physical and mental misfits, of those afflicted with a venereal disease, with epilepsy, with tuberculosis, with dangerous mental disorders. A more effective administration of the marriage laws would accomplish much. (On this point, reference should be made to the valuable study by Richmond and Hall on *Marriage and the State*, which deals with the administration of our marriage laws). It may be that the near future will see a far greater

utilization of voluntary sterilization as a means of preventing diseased offspring.

5. Consanguinity and Affinity

Every state today has a statute setting forth the persons disqualified from marriage because of family relationship. In each state certain blood relatives cannot intermarry. Brothers and sisters of the whole or half blood, ascendants and descendants uncles and nieces and aunts and nephews are universally forbidden to contract marriage. These were the persons disqualified by the statute of Henry VIII which settled the English law on the subject. With these disqualifications one cannot quarrel. We have a natural repugnance to the intermarriage of such persons. Furthermore, a good many states, twenty-nine to be exact, forbid the intermarriage of first cousins. Some go even farther and refuse to sanction the marriage of persons even more remotely related than first cousins. The question of the desirability of the marriage of first cousins is a moot one depending largely upon the character and the temperament of the participants. A majority of states, it is true, deem such marriages against public interest.

English law, patterned after the ecclesiastical law, further forbade the marriage of persons related by affinity, that is, persons related by marriage. In a good many states in this country no such disqualifications exist at the present day. On the whole there seem to be very few reasons for their continuance.

6. Miscegenation

Twenty-nine states have statutes which forbid the intermarriage of persons of certain specified racial stocks. These statutes, while prohibiting primarily the marriage of whites and blacks, in some states also disqualify the intermarriage of persons of other different races, such as Indians, Mongolians, etc. These statutes are to be found mostly in the southern, southwestern and western states. The idea behind them is racial purity. In most instances they are prompted by the racial character of the state population.

The idea behind these statutes seems to be sound. We are naturally opposed to such marriages. It is submitted that these laws should continue on the statute books. They purport to meet certain local problems. One must query their ultimate effectiveness, however. The intermingling of the races goes on in spite of them.

7. Evasive Marriages

Subject to certain qualifications, at common law a marriage valid where contracted was valid everywhere. This general proposition did not apply, however, where the marriage was one opposed to modern civilized na-

tions, such as a bigamous relationship, or where the marriage was against the strong local policy of the state, as an incestuous marriage.

With different laws in the various states, were the common law principles to obtain, the local marriage law of any state would to a certain extent be nullified. Citizens disqualified from marriage by the laws of the state could go into an adjoining state permitting such a marriage and thereby enter into a valid relationship.

It was to prevent such conduct that the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws approved the Uniform Marriage Evasion Act which has been adopted in whole or in part by five states (Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Vermont, Wisconsin). It aims to prevent a person residing or intending to reside in State X from going into State Y and there contracting a marriage which would be void if entered into in State X. Such a marriage, the Act provides, is to be void in State X. We need not note its other provisions.

The Uniform Marriage Evasion Act has not been fully effective. In the first place, it has been adopted by but five states. In the second place, it applies to "void" marriage only. "Void" marriages are bigamous marriages, incestuous marriages, and marriages forbidden by the miscegenation statutes. Again, the Act does not define what is meant by "residing" or "intending to reside."

Teeth must be put into the Act if it is to prove even partially effective. A consideration of the means of doing this is extremely important.

It must be noted further that a number of states have local marriage evasion statutes. These aim to prevent the citizens of one state from going into another state and marrying when the marriage could not have been contracted at home. A detailed study of these statutes is beyond the scope of this report.

It is submitted, however, that unless a constitutional amendment is passed giving Congress power to enact a marriage law dealing with the entire country, that each state must have some form of evasion statute. This is necessary to protect the marriage laws of this state.

8. *Marriage Licenses, Etc.*

In studying the marriage laws of the country one is impressed with the importance of the question of marriage formalities. Is a marriage license necessary, how is it to be obtained, what must one do to get it, where must he get it, who can issue it, for how long is it effective, etc? Who can celebrate a marriage? Where must it be celebrated? These questions are all of considerable importance. The answers to them vary considerably in the various states. These are

matters that it would seem could be effectively dealt with by uniform legislation. It should be recalled, however, that but few states have adopted the Uniform Marriage License Act.

One thing is important. The fees should not go to the license issuer. His salary should not be dependent upon the number of licenses.

CONCLUSIONS

In the future we are going to see society exercise more and more control over the qualifications of persons for marriage. This is indicated by the trends in marriage law legislation in recent years. Gradually common law or informal marriages will be abolished. This will occur slowly but surely. It is necessary if the interests of the state in the qualifications of parties for marriage is to be maintained. Again, more and more states will adopt advance notice laws in an effort to prevent hasty marriages. This desirable form of legislation has proved useful in the past. Furthermore, the states which have not altered the common law ages for marriage will do so in the future. This must come about. It will mean that the scandalous child marriages will no longer have legal sanction. But, it is predicted, that the greatest activity in the near future will be along the lines of health legislation. Here is an excellent opportunity to improve the race by forestalling the marriage of physical and mental misfits. More and more states will adopt eugenic marriage laws in an effort to control venereal disease, and the states which already have such statutes will improve their administrative machinery. As we learn more about mental incompetency more effective methods of preventing the marriage of such persons must be adopted. The control at the present day is entirely ineffective. The same is true in regard to the marriage of persons afflicted with epilepsy. It may be that the future will see a greater utilization of the voluntary sterilization machinery in an effort to control the marriage of mental incompetents. Little change is likely to occur in regard to the laws dealing with consanguinity and affinity and with miscegenation. They undoubtedly will remain much as they have in the past.

One further point must be stressed. It is easy enough to adopt new laws imposing new restrictions, new qualifications upon persons about to marry. But far more attention must be paid to the administration of such laws. Care must be taken to see that these laws will operate effectively. The law in action is far more important than the law on the books. It is imperative that methods be adopted of providing for a more adequate enforcement of existing laws.

A Plan for Successful Marriage

By DR. PAULINE PARK WILSON

Merrill-Palmer School

ANYTHING that is so universal an experience as marriage might conceivably have come in for thorough exploitation and organization by educational, religious, and political institutions had it not been for the philosophy of individualism and inviolability of marriage that has been held for many years in this country. Because of this, marriage has suffered from a lack of study and any really intelligent approach on the part of those entering it and those chiefly concerned with its perpetuation. Of late a gradually growing consciousness of the need for understanding and far-reaching assistance in much that affects the family has been observed.

The failures in marriage are blamed on every possible institution or condition remotely or intimately connected with it. That these are contributing factors, both positive and negative, and need to be scrutinized carefully, cannot be denied. In many instances effort already has been expended to evaluate and modify some of these influences. In spite of all the contributing forces it seems obvious from experience that those most responsible for the success or failure in marriage are the parents of the individuals undertaking marriage. Through them attitudes toward marriage are set. The oncoming generation observes security or lack of it in the marriage of their parents and reflects the attitudes of the home. Parents are in a position to make or not to make marriage and family life a satisfying experience. Somewhere along the line of his development every individual needs to incorporate in his thinking or understanding of himself a knowledge of himself in relation to others and an appreciation of the responsibilities toward marriage and satisfactions from it that may be his. The intimate relationship of parent to child makes this situation the most potent of all in laying the groundwork for marriage. Not the least of their importance is that parents are the prime factors in passing on to the individual family members recognition of a much needed philosophy of marriage.

Therefore any plan for marriage could not fail to recognize parents and potential parents as the key-noters around which all other forces affecting the family must revolve. Extension and improvement of

the entire program of parent education needs concentrated effort. Secondary education, although already carrying on some training for marriage and family life, undoubtedly must enlarge and strengthen its program to include an approach to marriage that is more applicable and meaningful to the student and less academic than in the past. Colleges need to revise the work they have given for marriage so that it becomes more usable and available, not only for those in professional training but for students in general. Planning and carrying out a school program for parents, somewhat paralleling that offered to the students, would not only give parents the help they are continually seeking but would bring about greater unity and understanding between the school and home on matters of vital concern. Education for parents must be strengthened wherever possible to insure long-time planning for more successful marriages.

In addition to this major attack, it would seem as though any group primarily concerned with planning for successful marriage must be forced to consider among other issues such things as the reorganization of domestic relationships courts, expansion of psychiatric services, and integration of psychological clinics with already existing services. At the same time the training programs for lawyers, doctors, teachers, ministers, etc. have incorporated little, if anything, that enables them to understand the problems of marriage and family life with which they are forced to cope for the young people and adults contacting them. Those individuals and institutions dealing most directly with the family need education along this line in addition to their professional training, that they may understand what they are doing or failing to do through education or clinical service.

After recognizing the individuals and institutions most directly and consistently concerned with marriage, it is well to bear in mind, when developing a program, that from the outset the clarification of those measures which are corrective, remedial, and clinical and those which are preventive and educational is important. There is evident need for both approaches.

Preparation for Marriage in the High School Program

By MR. LAWRENCE K. FRANK

Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation
New York City

AT the risk of seeming unduly facetious a high school program of preparation for marriage might start with Punch's famous advice to those about to be married: "Don't." Such advice is not unwarranted for those who, during the years of early adolescence are inclined to assume the privileges of adult life before they have passed through the essential processes of maturation and to embark, if not on marriage, upon precocious adventures and explorations in sex relationships.

Biologically the process of sexual maturation begins apparently about nine years of age and continues to about eighteen or longer. Puberty, marked by the menarche in girls and by less dramatic but equally significant gonadal development in boys does not signify sexual maturation, despite the popular belief to that effect. It is not yet clear when ovulation begins in the adolescent girl but the evidence points to a period of three or four years after the menarche before regular ovulation is established. Indeed it has been shown that in many girls it requires two or three years for menstruation to become regularly established—for the girl to "learn" how to menstruate each month. There is little or no evidence on the maturation of the male genitals but it appears that many boys do not mature until seventeen or later and it is probable that full spermatogenesis and prostatic secretion do not reach their adult functional level until late adolescence—eighteen, nineteen or twenty.

Deferred sexual functioning is therefore biologically justified by the slow maturation of the gonads and of the genital organs. When it is also recognized that every individual is bi-sexual, having genitals that vary widely from the specific male or female pattern and having both male and female sex hormones, it is evident that the adolescent during the high school years is still in process of differentiating as the man or woman who will be only partly male or partly female. This slow process of physiological maturation and only partial sex differentiation is often a source of anxiety to the adolescent boy and girl who may be intensely worried about the question, "Am I normal?", without having the reassurance that there is no definite norm.

In the recently published book "*Life and Growth*" issued by the Commission on Human Relations of the Progressive Education Association it is hoped that adolescents will find authentic answers to some of their curiosities and perplexities on this subject.

But there are definite advantages in this deferred maturation because the four or five years of adolescence following puberty provide an opportunity for youth to work out some of the very difficult personality readjustments from childhood to mature adult living, that are of crucial importance to marriage. It is in these readjustments that the adolescent boy and girl needs help during the high school years. If the high school can and will endeavor to help the individual boy and girl to gain some understanding and insight and find some resolution of his personality problems then it can make a large and highly significant contribution to the preparation of youth for marriage.

The pathetic eagerness of high school and college students to take courses in psychology is an indication of their desire for understanding of human behavior which the usual academic courses in psychology wholly ignore. Students seeking understanding of their own lives and help in their perplexing human relationships find little of value in the laboratory findings and experiments of scientific psychology. This does not imply any criticism of scientific psychology but rather to suggest that we attempt to provide something more relevant and illuminating in answer to the students' interests that now attract them to courses in psychology. What this should be is a question for exploration and experiment, but it is probable that effective communication of understanding and insights can be provided through observation of young children in nursery schools and through the reading and discussion of novels and plays and moving pictures and of case histories in which the development of personality from early childhood experiences in the family may be traced. But in such educational experiences it is important to remember that the aim and objective is not the amount of factual knowledge taught, to be determined by essay or objective type examinations but rather the new awareness and understanding communicated which can

only be inferred from the student's speech and actions. Are we prepared to undertake an educational program that can be evaluated only by the subsequent life career of our students?

It is customary to discuss marriage adjustment in terms of seemingly separate functions and activities, such as sex, emotions, personality and so on. This tradition obscures the essential wholeness of the human being who can only act as a total personality. As such his sex interests and activities will express his personality and feelings and his marriage will be biased if not distorted by the way he works out the personality problems of adolescence.

If, therefore, we are to discuss what the high school can and should do by way of preparation for marriage we should ask what are the exigent questions facing adolescents and how can they be helped to work out answers that are appropriate to their individual personality and constitutional make-up?

It is clear that during adolescence the boy and the girl need to achieve some independence from their family, if they are to grow up and become mature adults capable of entering marriage and accepting its privileges and its obligations. There is need for more understanding of the role of the family, socially, culturally and emotionally that can be gained only by achieving some perspective on the family. This calls for a presentation of the family in the various settings and expressions found in our own historical past and in other cultures. Such a book as *"The Family—Past and Present,"* prepared by Bernhard Stern for the Commission on Human Relations of the Progressive Education Association, indicates the wealth of material that could be used educationally in high schools and colleges to give students some awareness of the variety of positions and functions of the family and therefore of the possibility of developing a more desirable family life. While the adolescent clamors for freedom it is to be noted that he does not want freedom nor would he know what to do with himself if free. What adolescent boys and girls want, is not freedom, but rather release from the family regulations and requirements so that they can conform to the often more rigorous demands of their contemporaries. While these adolescent patterns are often incomprehensible, if not deplorable, according to adult standards, they are to be interpreted as the way in which boys and girls demonstrate their adequacy to their contemporaries, finding in these performances a much needed reassurance of their acceptability to their own age group and to the other sex.

In most primitive communities there are well organized initiation ceremonies for adolescents, conducted

by the elders as a means of introducing youth to adult life, testing their capacity for its tasks and privileges and definitely conferring an adult status that marks the end of childhood dependence upon the parents and the beginning of full participation in the social life. Since we do not provide any such initiation ceremonies, youth are forced to create their own rituals and tests that only too often are woefully inadequate, if not distorted, versions of their acute personality needs, at this period of development.

To meet these adolescent requirements involves a variety of interrelated adjustments. There is the achievement of the standards of conduct and dress prescribed by the age group which often involves conflict with the family code and discipline. These standards also prescribe the masculine and feminine roles to which each boy and girl wishes to attain, despite the frequent discrepancy between their individual personal capacities and adaptability for such roles and the requirements. There are therefore, often acute conflicts between the boy or girl and the family and acute anxieties over these stereotyped roles that are appropriate to only a small minority of boys and girls. The very confusion over the masculine and feminine roles today as men and women are caught in the social and cultural changes also must be recognized.

Here is where an educational program could be of greatest value by giving youth some insight into these experiences and some reassurance to relieve these anxieties. If we could manage to communicate to adolescents the now well-established bi-sexuality of everyone such understanding might be of real help, because it would serve to show that it is not only unnecessary for each boy and girl to strive to attain the traditional stereotypes of masculine and feminine, but it is a definite handicap and source of anxiety that will probably compromise their marriage.

This does not imply any tendency to confuse or abolish the sex roles or to foster either a sexless or a homosexual society. It rather points to the importance of recognizing that masculinity and femininity are two poles of an almost infinitely graded series of life adjustments in which each individual should be encouraged to find a place appropriate to his physiological and psychological capacities. We can then say that sex polarity is essential to happy marriage, not conformity to a single prescribed pattern for males and for females to which only a few can approximate. In so far as each person can accept his or her bi-sexuality and be accepted by others, one of the most serious threats to the personality and most difficult obstacle to marriage may be reduced, if not eliminated.

But here we must recognize that the acceptance of

the masculine or feminine roles, however defined, may offer real difficulties for individual boys and girls who have in early childhood failed to clarify the differences between the sexes and accepted their own genital organization. So many boys come to puberty without having emotionally accepted their phallic structures, usually because of their childhood experiences. Likewise so many girls reach puberty with a resentful rejection of being a female that is intensified by the menarche and the requirements of the feminine role; this rejection also derives from their childhood experiences and the failure to accept the female genitals. Thus, adolescence offers the last opportunity for both boys and girls to clarify their respective roles and work out a resolution of their conflicts over sex roles and functions. The educational program needed to further these re-adjustments presents a task that will require the utmost of restraint on the part of teachers and the maximum of insightful understanding by all those who are in contact with adolescents, such as counsellors, coaches, youth leaders, etc.

Another phase of adolescent education for later marriage involves a critical examination of our traditional ideas and beliefs about love and sex. We have inherited a belief about sex as obscene, low and degraded that poisons marriage for so many men and women. Moreover we are beginning to realize that with the emergence of woman as a personality who demands recognition of her dignity and integrity in marriage the traditional male sex ethics and practices are no longer tolerable. Young men and women today are hungrily seeking some formulation of marriage and of sex relations that will enable them to realize their ethical aspirations and express their new sensibilities. Most adults have been so distorted and baffled by the traditional sex teachings that they can offer little constructive help to youth today. Boys and girls need, above all, to be reassured that sincerity and integrity are essential to any fulfillment of their personality needs in marriage wherein sex functioning becomes a way of communicating, another language, between a man and a woman who admire and respect each other enough to seek to give each other fulfillment.

It will require many years to attain any clarification in this area but we can today urge upon adolescents the necessity of viewing marriage as a way of life in which a man and a woman can hope to find happiness only in so far as they achieve some maturity of sex and personality expression, which implies a capacity for an altruistic use of sex to give the sex partner fulfillment.

Toward such a clarification we can assure adolescents that, as products of Western European culture, we

cannot tolerate "sex freedom" but must have some ethical and emotional reassurance for our sex expression. Such reassurance must be more than the legal sanction of marriage to use the mate as a sex object. This means that marriage is primarily a question of personality expression which uses sex relations for those personality needs. Instead, therefore, of emphasizing the purely genital and procreative aspects of mating, adolescent education should be focused upon personality, and the exigent question of love and affection and the attainment of those values that are of greatest importance to the personality.

Here we can in all sincerity tell youth that they face the greatest opportunity and the most severe challenge to help create a saner, wiser and humanly more decent marriage than the adults of today have attained; that this can be approached not through revolt from restraint and repudiation of sex ethics, as is frequently urged, but by establishing a sex ethics that is more demanding and therefore more rewarding, because it is based upon a recognition of the personality and strives toward fulfillment of personality needs.

This points to another phase of adolescent development in which the high school program might be of greatest help. Since both the boy and girl are still in process of maturing physiologically, the adolescent years offer the opportunity for discovering what personality needs the individual has and what kinds of personality can bring fulfillment of those needs. Such discoveries necessitate a changed viewpoint about sex attraction which the adolescent needs to recognize as often arising from other individuals who may be wholly incompatible personalities. What this means is that a boy or girl may experience a strong attraction to one person who, as a personality, has little or nothing to offer for any sustained relationship. To realize then that, not only during adolescence but all through adult life, one will be exposed to many sexually attractive persons is to gain an insight into one's self that is of tremendous importance for marriage since it serves to focus attention upon the most critical aspect of marriage: to find a mate who can meet one's personality needs as well as one's sexual requirements. This point becomes increasingly significant as the adolescent recognizes that as one matures his or her sex interests and desires become increasingly dependent upon fulfillment of these personality needs. Indeed the search for happiness is just this seeking of a relationship in which one's personality needs can be met by a mate who "understands."

Adolescence, then, is the socially sanctioned period for getting acquainted, discovering the personality make-up of others and learning one's own personality

needs. Boys and girls in their own way realize this and in various social activities attempt to explore. What high schools can do is to help them again some clearer understanding and some insight in this area of human relationships. But it must be recognized that understanding and insights cannot be taught as lessons from a textbook; they can be communicated through esthetic experiences of novels, plays, poetry and the moving pictures in which the adolescent can *feel* emotionally what is being presented and can see others undergoing the same poignant human experiences as he has. Esthetic experiences are especially significant in helping boys and girls to realize more clearly some of the basic emotional differences of men and women that are so potent in marriage. In a recent volume, *Literature as Exploration*,* Louise Rosenblatt has indicated how English courses can contribute more effectively to this understanding of self and others.

Creative activities, such as writing, painting, acting, also offer the individual an opportunity to clarify his perplexities through the very process of creative work in which his personality is expressed and often revealed to himself. Today when the traditional roles and activities of both men and women are changing so rapidly the adolescent needs these creative activities in order to try out the new roles and relationships vicariously so that they can be tested and explored without the danger of actually living them out. As we are beginning to realize, men today do not know what kind of wives they want and so women are per-

plexed and anxious, not knowing what they should do and be; and the men themselves are perplexed and bewildered about their own roles and their place in life. Through either formal dramatizations or the informal spontaneous presentation of situations boys and girls can explore the alternatives and assay their meaning without the risks that attend more realistic experimentation.

In general then we might say that the opportunity in the high school program, for any effective preparation for marriage is to help boys and girls work out the exigent personality problems of adolescence and to gain as much understanding and insight as possible into themselves and members of the other sex. The best preparation for adult marriage then is not in precocious sex experimentation or premature coaching for marriage adjustments but in meeting more effectively the requirements of adolescent personality development. The understanding and insights needed for human relationships are the same for marriage as for all other areas of experience and the high school program can offer very real help in this provided it is recognized as an occasion for something more than didactic instruction or adult interference under the guise of counselling and guidance. Respect for the personality of the adolescent is essential if boys and girls are to respect the personality of others.

* Cf. J. L. Moreno's spontaneity tests in which he assigns roles to individuals to act out impromptu.

How it Happened

The snow was crisp beneath our feet
The sky was clear, the stars were bright
As swiftly through the darkened street
We gaily hurried towards the light,

That, shining through dark, heavy trees,
Would ask us in,—“Yes, if you please,”
“Will you come, will you come?”

And now when we were almost there,
We lingered by the gate a minute,
And Helen said with roguish air,
“If I ask something, will you do it?”

“If I ask mother to ask you,”
“To spend the night and week-end too,”
“Will you come, will you come?”

And later, on a winter night
Her dear head nestled on my shoulder
Before the warm, soft fire-light,
I asked to live and die for her,

I asked, “Now if both I and me,”
“Are each convinced we must have thee,”
“Will you come, will you come?”

—P. S.

The Luncheon Meeting During the First Annual Meeting of the National Conference on Family Relations, Held in New York City, September 17, 1938

Address by Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein on the Need of a White House Conference on the Family

I AM sure we all heartily appreciate the efforts made in calling this conference. We in New York realize perhaps—as others do not—the need for a national conference, especially in view of the crisis which seems to be developing in marriage and family life at the present time—a crisis as serious as the crisis which is developing in our economic system and political order. It isn't necessary for me to emphasize this to people who are acquainted with the conditions. There is a deepening rebellion on the part of children and on the part of women and corresponding restlessness toward the routine and regimentation of married life.

More serious are the results. You recall that there has been a very rapid increase in the number of estrangements and separations and divorces during the last two generations in the United States. You know the effects. You know that Professor Ogburn has stated that today there is one divorce to every 5-6 marriages. During the last 65-70 years population has increased by some 30%. Marriages and divorces have increased about 200% during the same period. Over 20% of our families are actually in danger of disruption, and something shortly should be done to correct these conditions. As I understand it, we have depended upon three agencies, the home, the school and the church, and those of us who have studied the work of these three must confess that the home, the school and the church have not been effective in solving the problem. It does seem to some of us, and to the New York State Conference on Marriage and the Family particularly, that the time has come to invoke the service and support of at least another agency: the Government of the State.

The state in America is primarily responsible for marriage and the family. The State issues the marriage license, and the State assumes jurisdiction over the marriage. But what is the State doing to protect marriage and conserve the family? What the States are doing is this: They are issuing the marriage license through a political appointee. They are reporting the marriage and then they are waiting for the breakdown to appear in the divorce court. There is nothing whatever done between the time the license is issued and the breakdown occurs. We submitted to the governor a brief two years ago asking for a program to be followed. Mrs. Greenbaum, Dr. Snow and Dr. Folsom

among those who were back of this. We would like to look forward to the establishment of a department within the framework of the State Government that will undertake to save marriage and the family in just the way the Department of Health and the Department of Education and the Department of Social Welfare serve their respective groups at the present time. I hope, personally, that the time will come when that will be done. The State ought to undertake a program for disseminating all the knowledge that is available—knowledge that is found in the social laboratories of our country but that is not in the possession of a great majority of people that need it. The time has come to democratize knowledge about marriage. The State could assist in establishing consulting centers throughout the State and across the country just as we have established child guidance and mental hygiene clinics. Normal men and women, married and unmarried, are just as much in need of this service as abnormal groups.

Another suggestion is that it does seem opportune at this time for the Federal Government to be called upon. In 1909 the late Theodore Roosevelt called a White House Conference on the Child. He did that because in 1909 we were all interested in the child. We were talking about the 20th century as the Century of the Child. It was a conference to consider the problems of the child. The outcome of the conference was the Children's Charter and the Children's Bureau in the Federal Government in Washington. Within the last 30 years is it not true that we have moved forward, that we have discovered many things that we did not know then? Instead of being interested in the child, instead of being interested primarily in the parent, we are interested in the family. It has come into the foreground of social thinking and social concern.

Something else has happened. I am sure that you remember 30 years ago we were all discussing divorce and the evil of divorce and within 30 years we see one very important thing: that the chief cause of divorce is marriage, and we should shift our interest from divorce to marriage. After all, the social conditions that develop in our country seriously affect marriage and the family. The economic collapse has serious effects upon married life. Take a young man and woman who are unable to marry because of unemployment or lack of money. We should consider the

family as the center of our effort. Take the housing movement. The family ought to be the center of the housing movement. We cannot rear the right kind of family in the wrong kind of home. It is self-evident that you cannot rear a normal family upon a sub-normal income. Two-thirds of the population are living on an income insufficient to live decently. We have learned all this in the last thirty years. Because we have discovered what we have: that the family is the basic human unit; that this family is threatened by danger at the present, the time has come for another White House Conference that will devote itself not only to the child or to the parents but to the problems of the family.

Think what it would mean to focus the attention and the conscience of the people upon the family as it is today! Such a Conference would be able to do a number of things. It would be able to do this. It would be able to coordinate all the various groups that today are interested in the family from different angles and different points of view. The Health group represented by Dr. Snow; the Educational Group by Dr. Folsom; the Law Group represented by Professor Sayre; the Social Workers represented by Professor Burgess and others. Why should we not all come together? It would mean a better family life in the

United States. There are other things to be done. The Conference could undertake to study and to revise the marriage laws of the United States. Marriage laws are all ineffective. Some changes are being made. A law was made to the effect that it was necessary to wait 72 hours after the marriage license was issued before being married. A number of people antedated the marriage license. The laws are inadequate. There isn't a marriage law in the United States today that really embodies the knowledge that we now possess regarding marriage and family life.

There are other things that such a Conference could do. It could help us to persuade the Federal Government to do for marriage and the family what is now being done in other fields. Think of the funds that are being set aside for the protection of animal life in America, for the conservation of natural resources, think of the funds appropriated for the building up of a war machine that means destruction. Why not spend a little money in developing a program that will mean the protection of marriage and the conservation of the family in America. This seems to be one of the objectives of a conference such as this. I hope the Conference will grow in strength and protect marriage and the family.

Address of Professor Ellsworth Huntington on The Happy Family with Sufficient Children to Survive

IN the Bible there are some quite fine pages. The Prophet Joel tells about the affliction of the people saying:

"and rend your hearts and not your garments and turn unto the Lord your God. . . . And it shall come to pass afterward that I will pour out my spirit unto all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions."

I hope I can be an old man who sees visions. My vision is that the family as an institution is going to go on declining for a while. It is going to reach its nadir, and then it is going to go up and it will be different. It will have all the valuable qualities of the old family, so far as they are needed, plus new qualities. Not all of the old qualities will be needed. In order to judge about this change, let us inquire very briefly as to two points:

- (1) What functions are served by marriage and the family in our present generation?

- (2) How far could these functions be equally well served if family life were abandoned; if children were wards of the State and cared for by the State?

The first function is to provide a recognized way for men and women to live together with the smallest number of complications. I feel confident that if legal marriage were abandoned the results of friction, quarrels and heart-burnings would compel us to return to a legal union. But legal marriage should be made impossible until after a very considerable period has elapsed from the time of application for the marriage license.

The second function of marriage should be the establishment of a complete family. I mean by that, that a man and woman and at least one of their children should live together permanently. Here we come to the most vital factor. Unless the family survive, I doubt if the rest will survive. It is only a matter of time before birth control will be universal. Under these circumstances, only in rare cases will women consent to have children unless they can also have the

pleasure of caring for them, loving them and making sacrifices for them. The normal woman wants a man and children for her own. What woman wants a child to have it taken away from her? The normal man wants his own child that belongs to him. Our system has got to be adapted to human nature. Unless the family remains strong and takes and cares for its own children, the birth rate will fall and the race decline. The family must become strengthened again.

Third function: in the old days a man expected to marry and take care of his wife and children, and the children would help in supporting the family. It was perfectly possible and desirable, both on the farm and in the town. That has ceased to be the case. No longer are children an asset among most of our families. As a rule, children have become an economic liability, not an asset. The family is a vanishing institution. I believe part of my vision—it is more than a vision—is for the public to take care of the expenses of the education, health and formal recreation of the children. The fundamental expenses of life will be carried by the State. The family will become insignificant. That means further decline in the family. We know very well that we have nursery schools and summer camps that will probably be run by the State. In the field of formal education the family has declined and will go on declining. But women will refuse to bear children, if they cannot be with them and guide them while they are young. This will stop the decline, and cause the importance of the family to increase again. The things a child learns before it is five are of supreme importance. The mother wants the pleasure of the earlier experiences with the child, when it is learning to walk, beginning to ask questions—there are no pleasures greater than those pleasures. There are hardships, but there are very few things in life better worth while. Life would become barren and uninteresting without them. Then the family is going to be the place where normal qualities, strength of character and early intellectual activities are well established. The character building is bound to remain in the hands of the people who take care of the children while they are little.

Life stresses differ in different civilizations. The stress of life in China is upon getting enough to eat and enough to wear. Here how many people have died of hunger even during the depression? If a famine came to China, 50 or 60 million would be

suffering from starvation. Four or 5 million would die of disease. So in China the stress comes on these things. Who here has ever worried for fear that he wouldn't get his next meal? Probably no one. Here our stresses are different. For instance, there is the stress caused by the failure of the child in school. The young girl or man troubles about love affairs. In China this is arranged by the parents. Looking for a job is another period of stress. Each period of stress is matched by a period of exaltation. These stresses make us old and make us work. Everyone who has the good fortune to have a good home is lucky. There is nothing better for relieving the stress of trouble than a group of sympathetic people whom you are perfectly sure of. There are a great many families where this does exist. That source of restfulness that comes from being in this atmosphere is a tremendous asset. That cannot come from any other institution. The church supplies some of it but not in that intimate quality.

Statistical part of the thing: It is a matter of mathematics to determine the number of descendants there should be. Large families are uncommon. Can we get together this ideal type of family which is widely spread through all levels of society? Can we get that type of family in which the complete family means not one child, but 2 children, 3 children or 4 children, for if we have less than about $3\frac{1}{2}$ the population will decline. One of the greatest objectives is to lay stress upon the fact that the family be above the average physically. The important thing is that those people should have this high ideal so that instead of diminishing the number they should increase in number. It goes on and on. Four-child families will go on. The number of children in the families which have this family idea will increase. So that each generation will have more and more children. In any movement for the family, the first thing is not to magnify the problem, but to realize the tremendous function of the family to prevent the nervous strain and stress which is getting worse and worse and to get a union between the high grade family of high physical and emotional stability and a sufficient number of children to carry it on.

[Only two of the addresses—and these with considerable omissions—and none of the introductions, given at this luncheon, are published in this number of LIVING]

Ways of Living

THE reader will see that we have three departments in succeeding pages that deal with particular phases of living: first, "The Future Adventure" second, "The Adventure Itself," and third, "Humpty Dumpty After the Fall." The first deals with plans and hopes for marriage, the second with marriage and the family itself, and the third mainly with the problems of young people after they leave school and before they have achieved an adequate place in active affairs. Now all three of these involve problems in the solution of which we wish to serve.

Perhaps the chief difficulty in discussing these things in the past have been two: first, the persons who wish conference or help quite properly do not want to reveal matters that touch the essential integrity of their lives; and second, even though they could bring themselves to seek the many helps that are undoubtedly available today, they hesitate to do so because there is not yet an honorable and adequate professional technique in which they can have confidence. Most important of all, this means absolute privacy and a convincing guaranty against revealing to others in any way their own thoughts and difficulties.

It seems to us that these two obstacles are real and important ones which must in simple fact and strict honesty be met before the scientific knowledge of today for happier and worthier living can be made available to people generally. In our *WAYS OF LIVING* covered by the three departments mentioned above, we shall accept three questions from any member of the National Conference on Family Relations. We shall consider that any question submitted is hypothetical, or if it is based on actual facts, then that it applies to some friend or acquaintance of the questioner. In this way we hope the just reserve incident to personal revelations may be honestly and happily perspected and protected. Anyone, therefore, may submit the most personal question, but with the understanding that it does not apply to the one who seeks it, but is purely hypothetical or vicarious.

As a second protection to meet perhaps the second difficulty, we assure those who submit questions that nothing submitted will ever be revealed, but that everything they say will be kept in strict confidence. The problem involved may require expert opinion from different professions or from different experts. The

answer mailed will be signed impersonally by the department involved. Thus in this way also, the impersonal, professional view and the strict confidence imposed by the questioner will be realized. The actual need, of course, will be highly personal and the importance to the one who inquires, of the particular advice, will be correspondingly honored by those who give advice. We shall realize always that a human being is asking a question of actual importance for him or her, and expects an answer that will meet an actual and personal need. But the impersonal form, and the requirement of privacy and professional obligation will be preserved throughout.

In brief, the questioner will always remain comfortably behind a purely hypothetical and imaginary question, and he or she will receive an answer that is signed by an impersonal department free from any quality that would intrude in this impersonal relationship. At the same time, however, the problems will involve actual difficulties, and will receive personal service on the basis of immediate human need.

Finally, the problems presented in the columns of these departments will never be based in any way on any material that is submitted to us for answering, even though that material in turn is presented in the form of a hypothetical or imaginary question. The problems presented in these columns, we hope, will be responsive to current needs, but they will not be predicated in any way on letters of inquiry.

It is the firm opinion of the National Conference on Family Relations that any counseling in human relations is preferably done by experts through personal consultation. Any service which this magazine renders is purely incidental to and subject to this main policy. For instance, there may be questions in some daily papers on "How to Keep Well," or on "Your Legal Rights," without in any way intruding on the medical profession or the legal profession. If the questioner desires more questions than the ones indicated above, these may be arranged at nominal fees, but we expect they will rarely occur. Where more questions are desired, we shall almost always feel that the questioner should see a professional consultant in this field, or a physician, or a lawyer, or others who are equipped to give detailed advice in the particular problem presented.

The Future Adventure

For most of the people in this world, marriage is by all odds the most exciting and the most worthy adventure that they can ever have. And how to get a husband or a wife to go on this adventure with the greatest happiness and the realization of the greatest accomplishment for each—that's the very thing that young men and women ought to scheme and work for with results a hundred times more successful than we usually find now-a-days.

"I know a secret, such a one
The hawthorn blossoms spider-spun
The dew-damp daisies in the grass
Laugh up to greet me as I pass
To meet the upland sun."

—WILLIAM VAUGHN MOODY

[QUESTION: I am twenty-one years old and have just graduated with an A. B. degree from the University. Much beyond my deserts I was elected to the Phi Beta Kappa, and I did special work in music in which I am said to have some talent. I am engaged to be married in the spring to a young man of about my own age who is earning a fair income now, and has reasonable prospects of earning larger sums later. I want to make a worthy use of my talent in music. Perhaps some day I can write music that others will enjoy. And what I want most of all is to be married and have at least six children. I am not worried about my music or my own happiness. If there is anything in me that is worthy expression in music I feel very sure I shall be able to write it and that the fine man I am to marry and the children we are to have will do more than anything else to help me write my music and have the happiest life I can imagine. But I am worried about whether I can make my husband happy, and whether I can be the best mother for my children. There is so much talk now-a-days about psychological defects and hidden physical defects that I fear at times I may have some defects or my husband may have some that would be bad for each of us and very wrong for us to inflict on our children. When I think of these things seriously, I feel that I am doing very wrong to worry, and that I should be sure of my husband and sure of myself; but then again I do worry at odd times in spite of myself. Is there any way for me to become more sure of myself and better equipped to be a good wife and mother?]

There is an awful lot of nervous, irresponsible talk about emotional stability (or the lack of it), defects

in personality, and mental deficiencies in the individual that may affect a happy marriage and the high quality of the children. It is important for one not to be made uncomfortable by this talk, much of which is highly unscientific, and nearly all of which is likely to be depressing. Fortunately there is now a new body of fairly reliable scientific knowledge that will help people in living together in marriage, and there is also a great deal of injurious and false material which one should happily and completely ignore.

Even the expert knowledge about wise ways of living together is not so new in one sense. It is new in that hitherto it has not been presented in this country by professional advisors in keeping with the different needs and conditions of our urbanized, industrialized modern life. But the able scientists in this field who are formulating this body of knowledge now did not pull it out of thin air or make it up themselves. In one form or another it has been in the world and has been serving human beings from time immemorial.

For instance, I recall a practice in Denmark where young girls of the nobility and the professional classes in the cities conventionally and regularly visit some grandmother, or aunt, or other relative, or friend in the country where the young girl learns housekeeping, and wise and healthy ways of rearing a family, and running a household, and making a husband happy, and understanding how to get that husband to make them happy. Perhaps the only thing in this country that corresponds to it is the tendency of the young girls of the wealthier classes to join the Junior League in their particular city and do something for charity in this way. Usually the object of Junior League charities

is the local orphanage, or some lying-in hospital, but the time given to these efforts by the average young lady is rather small, and she herself has almost no experience or knowledge of the actual orphanage or the actual hospital which she serves. Substantially, she serves charities impersonally through the very little money that they have as profit after the expenses of their social entertainments have been paid. But the practice in Denmark—and very similarly in most countries of continental Europe—involves a real training in the basic situations of life that come through living with someone else and giving new life, by which alone the human race continues in this world at all.

As I understand it, the object of modern counseling in human affairs is to conserve and increase this traditional knowledge which we have always had, and to make it available for young women (and I fervently hope for young men also) under modern conditions—where people live crowded together in apartment houses, and they have no farmer friends where the daughter of the house can visit and learn this traditional knowledge in the old homey way.

The amount of knowledge that is actually available now for living happily and advantageously in a home is encouragingly great, though, unfortunately, it has not been democratized. Most of it is still the possession of a few. It is not available to the great mass of normal, sensible people who could use it, and these normal, sensible people in turn are usually still disinclined to receive it anyway.

More particularly, in the matter of your question, there is the physical side of marriage, and, of course, there you can get pretty accurate information from

physicians as to your health and general welfare. But beyond this there probably is no cause to worry or inquire further; if you know that your family has been free from insanity or serious mental difficulties, and the same is substantially true of the family of your husband-to-be. You can acquire a phobia in some of these matters that can do great injury; and, saddest of all, the conscientious person who wants supremely to live worthily is the one most likely to acquire needless fears and even to develop a serious phobia on some particular matter. In a word, many of these matters stressed in an unscientific and even morbid way do not involve any real danger at all, but worrying about them or even thinking about them except in a purely casual way may be injurious.

Think of it this way: when they talk about difficulties in personality or emotional instabilities, just use your common sense and remember that all normal, healthy people have some variations in personality or emotional response, and these variations are entirely compatible with splendid physical and mental health and the very best quality of manhood and womanhood that the country affords.

Your prospects for success and happiness in marriage are a thousand times better than those of many who are still normal and worthy people in the community. In the humble and worthy sense in which you present your views, you should be proud in your own achievement and in the young man's achievement, and correspondingly sure and proud of your future happiness and accomplishment as very few people in this world could be.

The Adventure Itself

Culture comes from worthy people living together, provided they have the will and the capacity to give to each other and to receive from each other. The chief basic sources of culture that we now have are marriage and family relations. But it is reasonable for men and women to expect much more happiness and much more accomplishment because of their marriage than is now the case. Our efficiency and improvements in material ways of life are unusually great in recent years, but perhaps people generally are now less proficient in practicing happy and wise ways of living together than were people many years ago.

"Wi' kindly welcome, Jenny brings him ben;
 A strappin' youth; he tak's the mother's eye;
 Blithe Jenny sees the visit's no ill-ta'en;
 The father cracks of horses, pleughs, and kye.
 The youngster's artless heart o'erflows wi' joy,
 But blate and lathefu', scarce can weel behave;
 The mother, wi' a woman's wiles, can spy
 What makes the youth sae bashfu' an' sae grave:
 Weel pleased to think her hairn's respected like the
 lave."

"O happy love! where love like this is found!
 O heartfelt raptures; bliss beyond compare!
 I've paced much this weary, mortal round,
 And sage experience bids me this declare:—
 If heaven a draught of heavenly pleasure spare,
 One cordial in this melancholy vale.
 'Tis when a youthful, loving, modest pair
 In other's arms breathe out the tender tale,
 Beneath the milk-white thorn that scents the evening
 gale."

—ROBERT BURNS

[I WAS much in love with my husband when I married him. I would not have married at all if I had not been deeply in love, and if I had not considered marriage on what some might call a highly idealistic plane. I do not wish to give the details of those things that have caused me to change my attitude. Briefly, he has done many things which have finally killed my love, and I regard him on the whole with less affection and less respect than I do many mere acquaintances. It is intolerable for me to continue to live with him as his wife when all the bases of honor, and loyalty, and affection, and respect that I feel are indigenous to marriage have long since gone. We have two children. I do not want to deprive them of their father's love and care, nor do I want to deprive him of his children's companionship which is very dear to him. But I feel it is degrading for me to continue this marriage, and I want guidance in the matter of ending it with as little injury to him or the children as possible.]

If I may answer on the basis of what you say and what I think I can fairly read between the lines, then I venture to suggest that you may be bothered mainly by the old problem of the Romanticist. To put it logically, it may be phrased somewhat in the form of an Aristotelian syllogism: major premise, the honorable basis of marriage is love; minor premise, though married, I no longer love my husband; conclusion: divorce.

The trouble with this nice logic is much the same trouble we find in so many logical approaches to practical problems. The logical part is not so bad, but there is error in one of the premises. Now, formal logic goes on the assumption that the premise is true. If the premise is even a little untrue or inaccurate, then to build one logical deduction after another upon the erroneous premise is only to increase one's error and one's difficulty.

Now the error in the premise here turns on the word "love" itself. There are many kinds of "love." One may love lobster salad, but surely a mutual epicurean delight in this humble scavenger could hardly be a basis for marriage. Furthermore, we are told that even the clergy in their off-moments may love the high seats at the feast and the embroidered garments, yet surely this is not the love intended in marriage.

Pretty much all of the marriage ceremonies in use today in the Western world have come directly or indirectly from Biblical writings, and in the Bible we have at least three different words meaning "love," although all three of them are translated and rendered into English by the single word "love." For instance, love in the sense of honest delight in another person and affection for him is "phileo" in the Greek. This is what the good Victorians meant by romantic love, and what the Middle Ages meant by profane love. Our friends in the Middle Ages did not mean that it

was degraded in any way when they called it profane. They meant merely that it was of this world or of a transitory nature when contrasted with divine love that was of the next world and was eternal.

There is a good deal of "phileo" in the Bible on a highly worthy plane. For instance, when the scriptures speak of Jesus "loving" his disciples, and when they say that he "loved" to go down and visit Mary and Martha, they use "phileo."

There is another word in the Bible which is also rendered into English as love, namely, "thelo." It has a little more vitality in it than straight covetousness, but it is not really different. For instance, when our friends the high priests loved their seats at the table, and their fine garments, that was "thelo." Now, heaven be thanked for this, from the bottom of my old heart that goes back to days when a man could talk about spading a garden or mowing the grass without any connection whatever with sex: the fact is the holy scriptures do not use love in the blatant modern sense of mostly sex at all. In the Bible this sort of love is labeled "lust," and in a way this distinction was retained all through the Middle Ages. When the chronicles and the poets of the Middle Ages talked about profane love as against sacred love, they meant, for the most part, the very best of what we now call ideal love, at its highest, as against sex attraction, which again the Middle Ages very rarely even mentioned, and then only to dismiss it quickly and briefly as "lust."

But the most usual word used in the Bible and translated into English for love is "agapao." This means sacred love or, perhaps more vitally for modern ears, it means redeeming love. If it were not for the slobbering way which the low-brows talk about mothers, I would not hesitate to say that it means mother-love.

I think without exception in the Bible wherever we are commanded to love "agapao" is used. This destroys the modern difficulty about the so-called contradiction or lack of candor in promising to love when you marry. Not infrequently the view is expressed that love is a divine emotion and cannot be commanded. You cannot, as it were, love when that attitude is not actually a part of your thoughts. And hence, you cannot promise to love in the future or, if you have promised to love in the future and you cease to love, then as we have noted in the beginning, it is alleged that the marriage which rests upon this love should cease when love ceases.

This can only be true of "phileo," of idealistic or romantic love—that is, high delight in the other person combined with great respect and affection. But it is "agapao" which you promised to do when you

married. You promised to give redeeming love and this you can honestly and honorably promise just as you may engage to love your neighbor in the Biblical, redeeming sense, although this particular neighbor may be depressingly unwashed and distinctly unpleasant to you in many ways.

To get back to the question, I suspect you have taken high moral ground in a somewhat artificial way, and that there may even be a little hurt vanity along with everything else. The intense admiration, or hero-worship that is present at the time of marriage, we hope, and is altogether delightful to consider, need not necessarily be lost in succeeding years, but even in the case of the wisest and finest people it is at least somewhat changed and transformed into different elements just as life changes with the passing of time. This does not mean that it is destroyed or degraded. Its artificiality or its unsubstantial parts are forced to recede, while it is refined, if you will, into more lasting concepts that are, however, altogether lovely in themselves.

The considerate care with which you refer to your husband's love for his children and their delight in him, and your wish not to hurt either of them, show, I think, that underneath you have an abiding affection and respect for him.

As things go in this hard world, no doubt, he has done many thoughtless and short-sighted things that have hurt you and because of which you have had very real, and perhaps very just, cause for suffering. But that is just the point of the thing. Marriage is not a thing that you enjoy every day of your life in a perfect world where everything is easy. The glory and the triumph of the thing itself lies in the fact that you preserve the marriage, and strengthen it, and gain through it new beauty and new understanding, not in a perfect world, but in this very imperfect one with unpaid bills, and sick children, and selfish, pig-headed in-laws, and crying babies, and unwashed clothes, and stolid, unappreciative husbands for whom at times often saintly wives think a lingering death is far too good—it is in this sad, fantastically difficult world that our triumphs must be won. It is to win knowledge and courage and a kind of unearthly understanding through marriage under these seemingly impossible conditions that is the real success of a brave girl with a true heart.

Now there is nothing the matter with the "phileo," the delight and the charm that come from being with a person who appeals to us, and go right on thinking in these romantic terms and delighting in these high qualities. But it is the agapao which you promised when you married, and it is the "agapao" which will

help you on "blue Monday," and it is the agapao of redeeming love, the mother's love that gives more to the frail, backward child than to the brilliant one, and that never admits the possibilities of any break in that love or estrangement between the two—it is this love that takes courage to promise, and makes the brain real and the limbs and the feet ache with apparently hopeless work. But this is the one thing that is worth having when the transitory things are passed and the weary brain and bones can rest. It is the very stuff of life itself.

Think of it in this way. What if you do divorce him due to this momentary depression because of his very human frailties? Never mind about him, I'm not thinking about him. But what about you? Are you quite sure that you will get the happiness of brain and heart, the nameless delight of honest living with the man of your choice and the children that have come to you, if you close your brain and heart now and let them go? Love in this enduring sense is a thing you promise when you marry, but you keep on realizing

more and more of it while you live, and it is not yours to the full until you die. But if you divorce him now, are you not a little afraid that you have not experienced much of this soul-stretching that comes from redeeming love, and that the rest of your life may experience very little of it so that you will tend to shrivel up into a mere existence? Oh, plenty of living if you like when it comes to food to eat, a place to sleep, even fine clothes, and the outward counterments of civilized living, but once you have ventured your life itself on the chance of marriage and have children to taste the fullness and the depths that man or woman can have in this world, aren't you asking a good deal of chance to think that you can get this again in some other way?

Remember that your own capacities for giving and living and enjoying may be somewhat limited. Can you stretch them on again with the full satisfaction and conviction that you once did, if you let the inevitable deficiencies of human nature cause you to turn your back on this adventure and give up the quest?

Humpty Dumpty After the Fall

Every year the United States spends many millions in educating its young people, and parents and others give their best thought and affection in helping young people, but as soon as they have left school or college, then both the educational world and the families cease their efforts. The boys and, in a large measure also, the girls are told to go out and succeed. From a period of careful guidance and many cultural advantages, they are suddenly dropped without any guidance, and often under the most depressing and demoralizing circumstances. A few, after many needless hardships and a great deal of waste in effort, may make a success that represents the contribution to our civilization which their abilities and the money spent in educating them would fairly justify. But a very large number never do find their best place in life, and never do justify the money spent on them, nor render back to their country and the culture of their times the contribution of which they are capable.

This is stupid waste. While we spend more on education and are more solicitous for children than in most countries, we spend less than in almost any other country on guiding young people after they have left school, and before they have found established occupations. We are wisely tender of childhood, but we seem to be obsessed by a crass indifference to the whole-

some and reasonable success and happiness of the great mass of our young people once they have been duly "educated."

There are two solutions: first, do something to save the morale and strength of youth of young persons after they have begun "to make their own way in the world"; second, stop spending millions on preparing the youth of the nation for high service and wise ways of living which they never achieve (to the literal minded: this last solution is ironical).

"I hope I do not break the fifth commandment if I conceive that I may love my friend before the nearest of my blood, even those to whom I owe the principles of life. I never yet cast a true affection upon a woman; but I have loved my friend as I do virtue, my soul, my God; from whence, methinks, I do conceive how God loves man—what happiness there is in the love of God."

—SIR THOMAS BROWNE

ONE way to begin planning what we can do for American youth under the thesis set forth above is to be sure at the outset what we don't want to do. We don't want to regiment American youth either in its opinions or its ways of life. On the other hand, we do want to reduce the waste that comes from needless inefficiency and lack of intelligent forethought that are so strikingly characteristic of our present attitude. Let us say at once, therefore, that the planned training of young people in school and college for possible openings and possible occupations when they finish should be much more efficient than it is now. There should be some working relationship between the available openings that the country affords, and the training that is made available to fill those openings, and the men and women who have been trained and are ready to take these opportunities.

There is no intelligent planning now to fit men for occupations where there are reasonable opportunities, as against those that are much over-crowded. Indeed, there is a kind of mutual contempt and mutual antagonism between educational systems and those who control opportunities for employment in business and the professions. Now this is childish, if not vicious. There is no good reason why business and the professions should not work frankly and honestly with these who are training their future supply of competent workmen, in order that the correlation here may avoid needless waste, and that young men and women may plan their future field of labor more intelligently and avoid needless uncertainties.

But if we postulate improved technical devices of

this kind in bridging the gap between school and the established occupations, we still have not sufficiently cared for young men and women during this period. The cultural and moral forces that surrounded them in their homes and in schools are suddenly withdrawn before they have had any reasonable opportunity to reestablish new moral and cultural associations in their own independent lives. Nobody wants to pamper the young people or curb the vigorous and wholesome play of individualism. We do want to prevent sudden changes that are needlessly injurious even to the most rugged person, and we do want to introduce some intelligence in the connection between educational preparation and the later job, just as we insist on some intelligent relationship in other phases of life.

On the moral and cultural side, there are two great forces which we may call the right-hand and the left-hand of the young adventurer, and neither of these are much used now. The first is friendship, and the second is marriage.

At home and at school young people have had all matter of stimulating companionship. In their immature confidence they do not realize themselves how dependent they are on these forces of exuberant energy and high spirits. But when they leave school and seek a job, intending to make their own way in life in keeping with the well-intentioned but short-sighted traditions of our times, then they are often abruptly moved from their family, and their old friends, and all their school or college associations. They begin at the bottom in some business, do petty things and receive low wages. All the moral and cultural forces

that absorbed their leisure time before are now substantially removed. They live in poor surroundings and are exposed to all manner of injurious influences. And the fantastic fact is that they are exposed to their greatest dangers at the time they are entering on their careers—a time of inquiring youth when they are most susceptible to injury, and when they are peculiarly unarmed to protect themselves because they have lost the friendships of the past with their cultural strength and have had neither time nor opportunities to form others.

We cannot acquiesce in this forever. There must be a youth movement in this country, not exactly like the youth movements in other countries so far as traditions and methods are concerned, but very much like them in their honest concern for seeing to it that more of the fine young men and women who graduate from the schools turn out as fine older men and women, doing significant work in the community, some ten or twenty years later.

But, once more, the first great intangible in this side is friendship. It is the right-hand of youth, or the pillar of life, or anything else you want to call it. Fraternal organizations are not sufficient, and the conventional athletic association is also inadequate.

The young people need real companionship, one with another, that transcends all questions of big organizations in their mechanical colorlessness. They need the faith, and humor, and courage that one human being gives to another through friendship.

No doubt there is no complete or single answer to this, but one very humble and unpretentious solution might be found in hiking clubs or other athletic associations that redeem the element of honest companionship, and do not permit all life character to be battered out by the blows of official organization.

The Hostel Movement that is so general in Europe, and is taking some root in this country, is an excellent idea. Getting the people, old and young, to walk on their own feet rather than ride around in automobiles is a very considerable advance. But these things tend to long trips, perhaps largely in the vacation period and, meritorious as they are, they do not quite fill the everyday need of athletics and companionship, one and inseparable. Hiking clubs—just one in a club if you like—that are based on reasonable exercise among worthy people who can give and receive companionship—there is a lot in this idea. A brisk walk of half an hour or so every morning, or perhaps in the evening, might change a man's life.

Of all days in the week, Sunday is the most worthless and degrading for most young people. They don't go to church, they don't exercise, they don't play, and

they don't work. They loaf around and slip so far back morally and culturally that it takes almost all the rest of the week to bring them back again to the civilized level which they reached the preceding Saturday. Finally, the worst part of this worst day is Sunday morning, when they get up late and laze around, and do all manner of things of a petty, good-for-nothing nature that are far inferior in point of honest vigor to many outright crimes.

If something could be done to get young people out of bed Sunday morning, when all their reasonably necessary sleep is completed, and give them vigor of body and mind with good thoughts and stimulating surroundings, that would be a big gain in itself. Hiking clubs, or other organizations in this common sense and honest way of living, might be one small but real means of preserving or building that worthy companionship during this period of achievement that young people so cruelly need.

As friendship is the basic right arm for youth in point of morale, and courage, and high endeavor during this very difficult period when the poor creature perhaps hasn't anything—no job, no prospects, no material hope of any kind—then marriage is the left-hand (no disparagement) for the young man or young woman who is trying to get a foothold in life. Yes, I mean this quite seriously: there are cases in which I think the added responsibilities of marriage are justified although the young people are having a hard time keeping alive separately.

It is a cultural question and a question of basic morale, not of finance alone. One does not have to speak in hyperbole to affirm that many young people who have drifted in mediocre existence may rise to a real place in life if they take on the added companionship along with the added burdens of marriage, although they have not done well with their single responsibilities up to that time. It is the folly of our civilization to tell the young man to "go out and earn a living like a man" and only think of marriage after he is an established success and can present his wife, as it were, with everything she may want. We call that brave and chivalrous individualism, indicative of the high place of women in our civilization. But it is tainted with materialism, it involves a great deal of pretense for all its exaggerated chivalry, and the cruel, frustrating results of this code are shocking in the extreme.

Marriage has its material side to be sure, but the essence of the thing is spiritual in a basic sense. We really dishonor rather than honor marriage if we say that it is something the young man offers the young lady after he has achieved a sure and considerable

income. This leaves her out of the partnership in every real sense; it robs her of the adventure, and the fight, and the dangers. This code seems to be made up in about equal parts to serve in a subtle way the vanity of the man, and to dishonor the woman by keeping her in a dependent and pampered condition.

The basic difficulty seems to be that we postulate the young man must "prove" himself worthy of the girl—and this is interpreted to mean securing an established position before he seeks to marry. This is an offshoot of the *ancient regime* which the code of chivalry most unfortunately approved. Surely the sound analysis in a democracy in modern times is that both the man and women prove themselves worthy of marriage by their fine equipment for life, and their fine, gay efforts up to that time. Then the living together and the earning of a livelihood is their joint adventure, an honor and a challenge, and a source of new companionship for both of them.

The biological or philosophical basis for this sound view is that man does not live to himself alone and should not do so—and the same thing goes for women too. It is flattering, and false, and injurious to postulate that the young man achieves everything for himself before acquiring a wife. The old human race is divided roughly into halves (male and female), and those who belong to these respective halves are complementary. It is honorable, and right, and basically true that neither one should be sufficient to himself or herself, and that the success which each desires should be unattainable without the other.

We come back to our claim: young men and young women in fact should plan a marriage although they

have not yet achieved independent success by themselves, and perhaps could not do so alone. The basic cultural idea presupposes that they will achieve together what they could not achieve alone.

Friendship and marriage are the two main basic means by which youth can hope to preserve and increase the cultural values it has taken from its own childhood home and from its schooling to win its worthy place in life so that it can give back to civilization of our times a fair return for the wealth, and strength of morale, and cultural life it has received; and to realize within itself the completeness of life.

But all this presupposes that it shall be a worthy marriage; a marriage in which each looks up to the other, and one in which the wealth of youth taken from home and school is actively preserved and increased, rather than allowed to lie dormant, or be utterly forgotten as is so generally the case now-a-days.

[This department, Humpty Dumpty After the Fall, will deal in each issue with particular problems affecting young people during this most difficult and crucial period after school or college is completed and before the young man or woman has worked into some phase of life that is worthy of the person himself and represents a reasonable realization of his power to contribute to the cultural values of the time. Friendship and marriage are basic, but the practical and particular problems are most complicated and very numerous. The American Hiking Clubs, which Paul Sayre has been serving as president, should be able to contribute some experience; and any number of young married couples should be able to give much more.]

BOARD OF ADVISORY EDITORS

ETHEL R. McDOWELL
LAURENCE K. FRANK
HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD

ERNEST M. GROVES
ELLSWORTH HUNTINGTON
WILLIAM F. MENGERT, M.D.

PAUL POPENOE

LIVING

Published Quarterly by

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILY RELATIONS

Editorial and Business Office

Law Bldg., Iowa City, Iowa

PAUL SAYRE, Editor

Editorial Comment

Work of the Conference

Happily for everyone, our job is one that is not now handled by others and further, our job is one that will serve others and help each to realize his

own ambitions more fully. We want to bring together into conscious action and effective work the moral forces and the intelligent interest of the responsible and dependable people of the country in order to help human beings gain more happiness for themselves and indirectly further the cultural values of their time through wise ways of living together. We don't want to do the particular tasks that are so necessary to this general achievement. That is for the several professions and the several callings to do—school teachers, clergymen, physicians, psychiatrists, housing engineers, public health experts, social workers, lawyers, farmers, nurses and all the others who do useful work in the world.

Public opinion is now formulated upon many questions through national organizations—The American Legion, Parent-Teachers Associations, Labor Unions, churches, manufacturers associations, charity organizations, and many others. But this business of living happily with your husband or your wife and your children is considered to be a thing that takes care of itself.

Merely from the point of view of the money we spend on family life, one would think it of the first importance so that people would be concerned about whether it is pleasant or not (in the language of the market place, whether they get their money's worth or not). Unless one is married, almost any unexpensive room and plain food is sufficient but with marriage come big houses and fine furniture and all sorts of expenses for children. Do these things make the people who have them happier, are they better able to make their best contribution to our present civilization because they do possess them? Perhaps the sad truth is that many people have expensive homes only to spend as much of their time away from them as they can, because their marriage is unhappy and they find only heavy materialistic and needlessly combative elements there while they must go elsewhere for peace, inspiration and beauty. But to say that the place where life itself is created for this world is not a place of beauty and inspiration is to affirm a shocking situation which we honor by calling barbarous. The truth is that some phases of our civilization are evil and degrading below

those of many primitive peoples and the very considerable lack of happiness and mutual advantage in living together which we find at present is surely one of the most serious.

But if you say that these good forces must take care of themselves and that nothing can be done by a common consciousness and common effort to remedy them, then we must answer that this is apparently true perhaps but not really so, and that the experience of the past shows this.

For one thing, our different social organizations of a generation ago brought some things to us without effort which now we must seek, if at all, by honest work. There was a time when the young men and young women married at 18 or 20 and received enough food and farm implements from their parents to homestead new land themselves and set up independent families on their own land. Their doing work and play together was a kind of post-graduate course in wise ways of living. But now the wife is at home perhaps in some little apartment and the husband is in the factory or the office all day and the wholesome forces for education in living together are strikingly absent.

But not only is the situation different, but we deceive ourselves if we fail to realize that one or two generations ago there was a very considerable though if you like unorganized and indefinite scheme of education in marriage and mutual helpfulness. The grandmother went from one of her children's homes to another, watched the grandchildren as they grew up, and helped not only in training her children, but in carrying on the tradition with all the dignity and reverence of family folk lore. She helped to bring understanding to the new generation in wise ways of living—how to get on with your husband or wife if you like and how the children can find happiness in making their parents find happiness in them.

To this day, in many parts of the continent of Europe, this family counselling is a part of the established practices and firm traditions of the people—much stronger and more punctiliously observed than many laws in the statute books that are enforced by the sheriffs and police. It is quite usual for the young people who live in towns and the rural young folks as well, to visit some aunt or grandmother or other relative in the country for six months or more, during which time what we call home economics as well as

marital psychology and child psychology are very carefully taught and the young people carefully prepared for their future marriages and the happiness of their homes.

Thus in keeping with new conditions which require new methods, and with strict authority from the reasonably applicable of the past, we are right to work and plan for happy marriages and happy homes. Civilization itself by definition is a matter of living together in effective ways. All culture turns on this. If, therefore, the chief and basic source of all living together—marriage and the home—is trivial or purely mechanical, then surely we are proceeding in a very stupid and wasteful way.

The job of the National Conference on Family Relations is just this. We want the people themselves on their own initiative to become conscious of these things and to do something about them. And furthermore, we want to democratize the expert knowledge in family living that is now available and is used effectively by the few. Our organization is permanent. Eventually, we want to have a conference on family relations in every community and state, as well as the regional and national ones we have now.

Award of Merit

For the year 1938 the National Conference on Family Relations has presented its Award of Merit to Frederick Osborn with the following citation: "Administrator, Scientist, Able Worker for Human Betterment."

Mr. Osborn has been a leader in many undertakings for the advantage of his fellow humans in this world, but though his leadership is virible and effective it is most refreshingly modest and unobtrusive. We are told that even eternal ends may be accomplished indirectly, and we have seen time and again in history that the enduring leaders do much of their work through others. In this day of much noise and platitudinous comment, not the least of Mr. Osborn's many services may be the example he gives to his fellow men of what can be done through loyal, steadfast, honest work that looks away from self.

Regional and State Confer- ences on Family Relations

The National Conference on Family Relations holds only one annual Conference. But it encourages and assists in the organization of regional and state conferences. At present plans are under way for several regional and state conferences to be held in 1939. The New York State Conference on Marriage and the Family which held its first meeting in March, 1938, before the

organization of the National Conference will have its second annual conference in the spring of 1939. The organizing and executive committee of the New York State Conference is composed of the chairman, Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein of the Central Conference of American Rabbis; associate chairman, Dr. William F. Snow, American Social Hygiene Association; executive secretary, Dr. Valeria H. Parker, consultant in Social Hygiene; Frank E. Karelsen, Jr.; Ray E. Baber, New York University; Maurice A. Bigelow, Columbia University; Sidonie M. Gruenberg, Child Study Association of America; John Warren Hill, Domestic Relations Court; George J. Nelbach, State Charities Aid Association; and Dr. L. Foster Wood, Federal Council of Churches. The program committee has as its members Joseph K. Folsom, Vassar College, chairman; Ray E. Baker, New York University; and Helen Judy Bond, Columbia University. Members of the general committee include LeRoy E. Bowman, United Parents Association; Mrs. Ralph E. Brodie, N. Y. State Conference of Parents and Teachers; H. Edmund Bullis, National Committee for Mental Hygiene; Dr. Robert L. Dickinson, National Committee on Maternal Health; James L. Ellenwood, State Y.M.C.R.; Mrs. David Goldfarb, Federation of Jewish Women's Associations; Frederick L. Guggenheimer, City Affairs Committee; Dr. William H. Holmes, Superintendent of Schools, Mt. Vernon, New York; Dr. Edward L. Keyes, Cornell University Medical College; Eduard C. Lindeman, N. Y. School of Social Work; Mrs. James Lees Laidlaw, New York City; Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Methodist Episcopal Church; Dr. Henry Neumann, Ethical Culture Society; Margaret Rich, Family Welfare Association of America; Dr. Robert Searle, N. Y. Federation of Churches; Mrs. Robert E. Speer, National Board Y.W.C.A.; and Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Free Synagogue.

On October 21 a meeting was held at Chicago with Arthur J. Todd, Northwestern University, presiding, to consider the advisability of holding a Mid-West Regional Conference. Professor Paul Sayre, president, National Conference on Family Relations, was present and made an address on its history and objectives. He emphasized the need for promoting human values in marriage and family life in a world of stress and strain. He proposed that there be annual meetings for each regional conference, a yearly national conference, and annual meetings for each state conference. It was his suggestion that such conferences include all persons and agencies working for the promotion of family relations. He suggested, specifically, such groups as lawyers, physicians, housing experts, and social workers.

The appointment of a committee was authorized to

make a concrete proposal of plans for a regional conference. The persons present at this meeting were Lita Bane, University of Illinois; Frances B. Becker, Family Welfare Society, Madison, Wisconsin; Howard Becker, University of Wisconsin; L. Guy Brown, Oberlin College; E. W. Burgess, University of Chicago; Mrs. W. F. Dummer, Mary Boule Foundation; Evelyn Millis Duvall, Chicago Association for Child Study; Mrs. Eva L. Lawton, Chicago Association for Child Study; Mrs. F. Russell Lyon, Illinois Congress Parents and Teachers; Ethel R. McDowell, Municipal Court of Chicago; Harriet Mowrer, Evanston, Illinois; Ulyssa Alice Rakstes, Court of Domestic Relations; Joseph C. Rheingold, Chicago, Illinois; Max Rheinstein, University of Chicago Law School; Lydia J. Roberts, Department of Home Economics, University of Chicago; Paul Sayre, Law School, University of Iowa; Dr. Paul L. Schroeder, Institute for Juvenile Research; Dr. Conrad S. Sommer, Illinois Society for Mental Hygiene; A. J. Todd, Northwestern University; Mrs. E. E. Waful, Chicago Woman's Club; Grace Weyker, Illinois Society for Mental Hygiene.

Under the leadership of Dr. Harriet Dagget, Law School, Louisiana State University, plans are in progress for a Southern Regional Conference. Already in the South two state committees have been appointed for Louisiana and for Tennessee. The members of the Louisiana Conference committee are Fred C. Frey, Dean of the College, Louisiana State University, chairman; A. R. Johnson, Director, State Department of Public Welfare, Baton Rouge; L. J. Fox, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute; Susan Gillean, Executive Secretary of the Children's Bureau, New Orleans; Elizabeth Wisner, School of Social Work, Tulane University; Alvin Good, Louisiana State Normal; R. E. Arne, Director Graduate School of Public Welfare Administration, Louisiana State University; Ellen LeNoir, State Home Demonstration Agent; Harriet Daggett, Louisiana State University; Cecil Morgan, Lawyer, Standard Oil Company, Shreveport; Gaston Forterie, Attorney General of Louisiana. The members of the Tennessee Conference committee are E. T. Krueger, Nashville University, chairman; Delbert Mann, Scarritt College; Mrs. Julius Mark, Nashville; S. L. Smith, Provost, George Peabody College for Teachers; Ellen Wallace, Director, Field Service Division, State Department of Public Welfare; C. Alicia Dickson, Department of Home Economics, George Peabody College for Teach-

ers; R. H. Kilburn, University of Chattanooga; W. E. Cole, University of Tennessee; Mrs. E. G. Riddick, Director, Children's Bureau, Memphis; Mrs. Wiley Morgan, President, Tennessee Federation of Woman's Clubs; Mrs. L. W. Hughes, State President, Parent Teachers Association; Charles S. Johnson, Fisk University.

Plans for state conferences and for participation in regional conferences are going forward in other states. The following persons have been appointed members of the Michigan State Committee: Ernest B. Harper, Michigan State College, chairman; Robert Angell, University of Michigan; Ruth Bowen, Deputy Director, State Welfare Department, Lansing; Arthur Dunham, Institute of Public and Social Administration; Robert G. Foster, Merrill Palmer School; Richard Fuller, University of Michigan; Abbott P. Herman, Hillsdale College; Raymond Hightower, Kalamazoo College; Charles H. Hoffer, Michigan State College; Dr. H. R. Hunt, Zoology Department, Michigan State College; Donald Marsh, Wayne University; E. T. Mitchell, Michigan State College; and Edna White, Merrill Palmer School.

The membership of the Washington State Committee includes Norman S. Hayner, University of Washington, chairman; Arlien Johnson, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Washington; Judge William Long, Court of Domestic Relations; Dr. Carl Helwig, gynecologist; Evangeline Starr, Divorce Proctor, Seattle; Dr. Charles W. Miller, Jr., Eastern State Hospital; Sara Brown, School of Social Work, Washington State College; Carl M. Dent, Washington State College; Marvin R. Schafer, College of Puget Sound; Ruth FitzSimons, State Department of Social Security.

Information about the development of plans for cooperation with the National Conference on Family Relations in other states may be secured from William S. Bernard, University of Colorado, Boulder; E. H. Sutherland, Indiana University, Bloomington; L. Guy Brown, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio; Howard Becker, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

[Professor Burgess has taken the major responsibility for the State and Regional Conferences. The above statement is taken from his report. It should be added, however, that regional conferences have also been arranged for the southeastern states and the Pacific coast states. Statements in regard to these will be given later.]

Stories for Children

Three Horses

AFTER luncheon Susan began to grow sleepy. It was Saturday. She had been up early and played very hard all morning. She went right on playing, but now she didn't have so much fun. Soon she decided to leave her games and just sit on the couch and think about pleasant things to do.

She thought how much fun it would be to have a horseback ride on a nice big horse with a long mane and a soft nose and sides and legs and neck which she could pat. When she thought about the horse and what fun it would be to ride on his back she could keep awake, no matter how sleepy she was. At least she thought she could, but after awhile as she sat still, thinking of the horseback ride, her head fell back and she went sound asleep.

It often happens that when one thinks pleasant thoughts while he is awake, these thoughts seem to come to live with him when he goes to sleep. This is what happened to Sue when she thought about the horses. She was no sooner asleep than she dreamed about three horses.

All three of the horses were very different from any of the horses she had known before. There was a *black* horse and a *white* horse and a *brown* horse. They were all playing in the pasture down in the field by the barn. There was rich grass to eat and a nice pool of water from which to drink. This was very pleasant for the horses, but it was not very exciting for them.

After they had run about and played for awhile in the pasture, Sue (in her dream) heard the *black* horse say to the *white* horse and the *brown* horse: "Let's get our blankets on and our saddles on and our bridles on and all go up to the house and get Sue; then we will go off for a ride together and have the most fun!" The *white* horse and the *brown* horse thought this was a great idea. They went into the barn, and each lifted up his head, pulled down a blanket and threw it onto his back. Then they all put their saddles on and their bridles on and each helped to fasten them on for the others.

Then they all went, trot, trot, trot up to the house to get Sue, because it would be no fun for any of them to go off riding alone. The real fun was in having Sue along and each one wanted her to ride on him. When they got to the house the *black* horse gave a loud whinny (whi-whi-i-i-i-ny). Then he stamped with his feet to let Sue know that he wanted her to

come down and go for a ride. Sue had never refused a chance to go for a ride yet. She certainly was not going to refuse now with such fine invitations from three horses at once.

Down she came, running and laughing, jumped on the *black* horse's back and off they went. The *black* horse was in front with Sue on his back, and the *white* horse and the *brown* horse trotted side by side a little bit behind them.

They went down the road from the house and out through the gate and along the highway. First, on the right side of the road, they saw lots of cows. Some were red, some were black, and some were part white and part black. There were also some calves; and one big cow seemed to have a great deal to say about the calves. "Moo, moo, moo," she called.

Just beyond the cows there was an orchard of apple trees and these trees were covered with blossoms. As they went by, the pink and white blossoms made the air fresh and sweet and made the fun of riding all the greater.

Farther down the road they saw a lot of horses running around loose in a pasture. They seemed to have almost as much fun as Sue and her three friends, the *black* horse, the *white* horse, and the *brown* horse. Some of the horses in the pasture were running, first this way and then that way, just to show how happy they were to be together and to be free. On one side of the pasture a gray horse pricked up his ears and listened, while toward him came running a big red horse that whinnied while he ran (whi-whi-i-i-i-ny). The gray horse whinnied also and when the red horse reached him they both ran off together. Then they slowed down and walked along side by side. Finally they stopped and the red horse put his head over the gray horse's neck.

Of course Sue did not know what they thought about, but it seemed they were happy to be together and they could enjoy their freedom and their comforts more by sharing them with each other.

After a long ride, Sue and her three friends came to the foot of a hill. Sue got off the *black* horse's back and sat down on the ground at the foot of the hill to rest. All three horses around her rested too.

It was fun to look at the high hill covered with woods and to think about climbing it. She wondered how things would look when she got on top of the

hill. It was fun to hear the horses eating grass and to see the birds in the trees. While she looked at the birds, a squirrel up in one of the pine trees made a jump from the limb where he sat and landed on the limb of an oak tree nearby.

After they had rested, Sue got up on the *white* horse's back and they went slowly up the hill. The *black* horse walked behind with the *brown* horse and all of them were having a fine time. When they finally got on top of the hill it was great fun. Sue could look all around.

She could see the river down below, on the other side of the hill. She could see the houses that looked so small, and the road that seemed to be only a narrow line between the fields. Along this road the autos went by. They looked like little ants, but somewhat bigger and faster than the ants that Sue found in the grass.

There were clouds in the sky and bright sunlight everywhere. She couldn't touch the clouds but that didn't matter. She was very near to them and could watch them as they sailed by.

She couldn't decide which horse she liked best. It seemed that she liked the horse best on whose back she was riding. She could pat his warm soft coat and feel his thick mane. Before she got on his back she could feed him a lump of sugar and his soft wet lips would touch her hand when she gave it to him.

Soon she was ready to go home. She got up on the *brown* horse's back and went down the side of the hill toward the river. The *black* horse and the *white* horse walked behind. The *brown* horse was glad to have Sue on his back and he also was glad to go fast because he thought he was going home. Indeed the *brown* horse knew his way home as well as Sue did. It was lots of fun to think that her horse knew his home and was very happy to go home with her.

They soon got to the foot of the hill. Then all three horses went right into the river with the water

almost up to Sue's feet and the horses splashing across and taking a little drink as they went.

You remember, Sue was now riding on the *brown* horse. When the *brown* horse was drinking, Sue could feel the water go down his neck and she could feel him grow fatter as the water filled him up. But it was not good for him to drink too much. Soon they reached the other side of the river and trotted off down the road.

There were fields of corn and hay on one side, and fields of pasture and fruit trees on the other. Now they came to some sheep, lots and lots of them. The sheep seemed to stay close together and just walk slowly over the grass, eating as they walked and not seeing anything.

Finally, Sue came to her home gate. She rode along the driveway and up to the front porch, home again. She got off the *brown* horse and then told the *brown* horse and the *black* horse and the *white* horse what a fine time she had had. She said that they had better go back to the barn, take off their bridles, and their saddles, and their blankets, and roll around in the pasture where they could stretch themselves. The *black* horse and the *white* horse and the *brown* horse said this would be fine and that they had had the best trip they had enjoyed in a long while.

Then it seemed to Sue that there were no more horses anywhere, and no more porch and bright sunlight and cool shadows. Everything seemed just quiet and peaceful. Slowly the sleep passed from her eyes and Sue woke up with her head on the side of the couch and her left foot under the pillow.

Wasn't that a nice dream and weren't they lovely horses? Of course these horses talked and did many things that Sue had never known real horses to do. But she thought even these dream horses were not as dear to her as the live horses she herself had known.

—P. S.

First Annual Meeting
of
The National Conference
on
Family Relations

Saturday, September 17, 1938

Hotel Pennsylvania
New York City

PROGRAM OF MEETING

9:00 to 9:30

Registration

Morning Sessions

9:30 to 12:30

SOCIAL STATUS OF THE FAMILY

Chairman: Miss MARY ANDERSON

Director, Women's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

Marriage Laws

Professor ALBERT C. JACOBS, School of Law, Columbia
University, New York City

The Parole System

Dean WILLIAM H. LEARY, School of Law, University of
Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah

Working Mothers

Professor HANS VON HENTIG, Law School, University of
Colorado, Boulder, Colorado

Housing Problems

Professor and Mrs. ERNEST M. GROVES, University of
North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Unemployment: Its Effects on the Family

Professor W. F. OGBURN, University of Chicago, Chicago,
Illinois

Divorce, Separation and Alimony

Professor MAX RHEINSTEIN, School of Law, University
of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Hospitalization for the Poor

Dr. KINGSLEY ROBERTS, M.D., Medical Director, Bureau
of Cooperative Medicine, New York City

DISCUSSION

9:30 to 12:30

CHILDREN AND THE FAMILY

Chairman: Miss BEATRICE McCONNELL
Director, Industrial Division, Children's Bureau
U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

Number and Quality of Children Born

Professor ELLSWORTH HUNTINGTON, Yale University;
President, American Eugenics Society, New York City

Athletic and Moral Training Organizations Affecting
the Family: (Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, etc.)

Professor SOPHONISBA P. BRECKENRIDGE, University of
Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Juvenile Delinquency

Dr. F. LOVELL BIXBY, Osborne Association, New York
City

Placing of Orphans in Private Homes Rather Than
Elsewhere

Professor and Mrs. LEE M. BROOKS, University of North
Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Effect of Divorce on the Children

Dr. SIDNEY E. GOLDSTEIN, *Chairman,* New York State
Conference on Marriage and the Family, New York City

Financial Aid for Motherhood

Mr. VICTOR FRANCIS CALVERTON, *Editor,* Modern Month-
ly, New York City

DISCUSSION

12:30 to 2:30

Luncheon Meeting

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE FAMILY TO THE CULTURAL WEALTH OF THE NATION

(Chairman, PAUL SAYRE)

ADDRESSES BY

Dr. SIDNEY E. GOLDSTEIN

Chairman, New York State Conference On Marriage
and the Family, New York City

Professor ELLSWORTH HUNTINGTON

Yale University; President, The American Eugenics
Society, New York City

Miss MARY ANDERSON

Director, Women's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

Miss LOUISE STANLEY

Chief, Bureau of Home Economics, U. S. Department
of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Afternoon Sessions

2:30 to 5:30

BACKGROUNDS OF FAMILY SUCCESS

Chairman: Miss LOUISE STANLEY

Chief, Bureau of Home Economics, U. S. Department
of Agriculture, Washington

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

Biological Basis of the Family

Mr. FREDERICK OSBORN, Director, American Eugenics
Society, New York City

Heredity in Relation to the Family

Dr. PAUL POPONOE, Director, Institute of Family Rela-
tions, Los Angeles, California

Predictable Factors in the Success or Failure of Marriage

Professor ERNEST W. BURGESS, University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois

Plan for Successful Marriage

Professor JOSEPH K. FOLSOM, Vassar College, Pough-
keepsie, New York

Housing Plans: A National Outlook

Mr. ERNEST M. CULLIGAN, Housing Authority, U. S.
Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

DISCUSSION

2:30 to 5:30

CULTURAL VALUES SECURED THROUGH FAMILY RELATIONS

Chairman: Honorable ROSWELL MAGILL
Undersecretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES

Social Security: Policy and Practice

Mr. GEOFFREY MAY, Office of the Director, Social Se-
curity Board, Washington, D. C.

Avoidance of Divorce by Judicial Agencies or Other- wise

Judge JOSEPH N. ULMAN, Supreme Bench of Baltimore,
Baltimore, Maryland

Gap Between School and the Established Occupation

Professor E. B. REUTER, University of Iowa, Iowa City,
Iowa

Preparation for Marriage in College

Professor MOSES JUNG, School of Religion, University
of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa

Preparation for Marriage in High School

Mr. LAWRENCE A. FRANK, New York City

DISCUSSION

The National Conference on Family Relations

ARTICLE I. NAME

This Association shall be known as The National Confer-
ence on Family Relations.

ARTICLE II. PURPOSE

The purpose of the Association shall be to advance the
cultural values that are now principally secured through
family relations, for the advantage of the individual and the
strength of the Nation.

ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP

Individuals may be elected to membership by the Executive
Committee upon payment of the dues as provided by the
by-laws. Other organizations active in the field of family
relations may become affiliated with this Conference upon

election by the Executive Committee and payment of the dues
in keeping with the by-laws.

ARTICLE IV. OFFICERS

The Officers of the Conference shall be a President, a
Vice-president, a Secretary-treasurer, and ten (10) members
of an Advisory Council. As officers acting together, they
shall be known as the Executive Committee and shall ex-
ercise all powers given to this Committee.

ARTICLE V. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

After the first annual meeting, September 17, 1938, the
President and Vice-president shall be elected for one year
only to serve in each office respectively. They shall both be
elected at the same time, the Vice-president to serve for one

year during the President's term of office and then automatically for the next year as President himself. The Secretary-treasurer shall be elected by the Executive Committee in keeping with the by-laws, and all other officers shall be elected by the Executive Committee in keeping with its later provisions.

Ten (10) members of the Advisory Council shall be elected for a term of five (5) years and shall be eligible for re-election. Members of the Advisory Council who serve for the year 1938-39 shall draw lots according to which two of them shall serve one year, two for two years, two for three years, and two for four years, and two for five years; thereafter, as their several terms shall end, they shall be elected for five-year terms as hereinbefore provided.

The President, Vice-president, and Members of the Advisory Council shall be elected by vote of all members, conducted by mail in keeping with the by-laws of the Conference itself. But preceding this election, a nominating committee, appointed by the President, shall nominate three persons for the office of President or Vice-president (as the case may be), and five persons for the two vacancies on the Advisory Council. There shall also be places on the ballot for individuals at the election to write in other names which shall be counted and any 10 per cent of the members may initiate other nominations for these offices. In case of death or resignation of any officer, the Executive Committee shall select his successor for the unexpired term.

Any regular constituted meeting of the Conference itself shall have power by majority vote to authorize action not expressly precluded by this Constitution, provided this authorization is later approved by the executive committee. If the executive committee disapproves such authorization of the Conference itself it shall always submit the action of the Conference to such vote of the members not later than the next annual election, and a majority vote (by mail) of the members, shall validate the action of the Conference meeting.

ARTICLE VI. DUTIES OF OFFICERS

By and with the cooperation and approval of the other members, the President shall have the general responsibility for the work of the Conference. He shall preside at all meetings of the Executive Committee, and of the Conference itself. He shall call meetings of both these bodies and shall appoint committees and carry on all other work of the Conference, subject to the provisions of the Constitution and the By-laws, and the express resolutions of the Executive Committee.

The Vice-president shall assist the President and the other officers in a general way, but shall not be called upon for particular duties (without his consent) during his office as Vice-president.

The Secretary-treasurer shall keep the monies of the Conference, shall keep all the records of the meetings of the Executive Committee, and of meetings of the Conference itself, and of all other official activities of the Association. Under the President, he shall be the officer of general executive authority.

The Executive Committee shall have power by majority vote to pass by-laws affecting dues for individual members and dues for affiliated organizations, and matters generally affecting the administration of the Conference. All officers not expressly covered in this constitution shall be elected by the Executive Committee.

The duties of the Advisory Council are covered by their

duties as members of the Executive Committee apart from their general undertaking to further the interests of the Conference throughout the country.

ARTICLE VII. AMENDMENTS

Amendments to this Constitution may be approved by majority vote of the Executive Committee and submitted to the membership and these in turn will become a part of the Constitution if approved by three-fourths of those voting on the amendment or a clear majority of the whole membership. Amendments to the Constitution may also be initiated by ten (10) per cent of the members as in the case of nominations for office.

BY-LAWS

(1) For the year 1938-39 the dues for individual members shall be \$2. Organizations interested in this field may become affiliated with the Conference upon indication of the Executive Committee.

(2) Official members for purposes of the first meeting September 16th and 17th, 1938, shall be those who have paid the registration fee, but only those who have paid the full dues of \$2.00 shall be members for purposes of the annual election.

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILY RELATIONS

OFFICERS, 1938-39
Advisory Council

ANNE D. BLITZ
Dean of Women
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

HARRIETT S. DAGGETT
Professor of Law
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

ISABEL E. LORD
Editor and writer in Home
Economics
Brooklyn, New York

ETHEL R. McDOWELL
Director, Social Service
Department
Municipal Court of
Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

GEOFFREY MAY
Assistant Executive
Director
Social Security Board
Washington, D. C.

WAYNE L. MORSE
Dean of University of
Oregon Law School
Eugene, Oregon
Director, Dept. of Justice
Attorney General's Survey
of Release Procedures
Washington, D. C.

C. RUFUS ROREM
Director, American Hos-
pital Association
Chicago, Illinois

MIRIAM VAN WATERS
Superintendent, Women's
Reformatory
Framingham, Massachusetts

CHESTER G. VERNIER
Professor of Law
Stanford University
Stanford University, Calif.

CARL C. ZIMMERMAN
Professor of Sociology
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Secretary-Treasurer, ERNEST W. BURGESS
Professor of Sociology, University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Vice-President, HUNTINGTON CAIRNS
Member of the Baltimore Bar,
Baltimore, Maryland

President, PAUL SAYRE
Professor of Law, University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa